THE

MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. XLI.] MAY. [Vol. IV.

BIOGRAPHY.

A SUPPLEMENT TO THE MEMOIRS OF THE REV. HUBERT STOGDON.

No. I.

His declaration at his ordination.

EVERY one was born for nobler ends than to go to and fro in the earth, and walk up and down in it, and is obliged to do and get as much good in the world as he is able. And as circumstances now are, I do not know any other way, wherein I may be more capable of being as serviceable to God, as useful to others, and as profitable to myself; I am therefore willing, if I may be judged worthy, to devote myself to this awful work; that I may be in a better capacity of working out my own salvation, and be made an instrument in the hand of God for promoting the salvation of others.

"Who is sufficient for these things?" But I trust the grace of God will be sufficient for me. Therefore I promise in his strength and assistance to be diligent, faithful and constant, in the discharge of the several duties of this important trust.

I hope, that God will ever give me such a value for the truth, as to search after it impartially and to conform to it universally, as far as I know it. But considering how liable I am to error myself, and how apt frail man is to call error truth and truth error; I hope God will ever enable me to regulate and temper my zeal with humility, knowledge, moderation and charity.

I have been made so sensible of the sad and dismal consequences of schisms, animosities and divisions among Christians, that unless I am deceived, I could willingly lay down my life, to cure those wounds of the church: therefore I hope, I shall be religiously careful never to be the cause of any myself, and do what in me lies, to heal those that are.

Jesus Christ is king in his own kingdom. And as such, he only hath authority to determine upon what condition any person shall be made a minister in it. Some of my brethren tell me, that they also have a right to insist upon certain conditions, which our lord and master has no where specified. In this case, I will say with St. Paul, "I will be brought under the power of no man;" nor bow my knee to any, but to him, to whom "every knee must bow." For this cause my brethren have shut me out. Therefore I am obliged to seek my ordination from those, who profess to do it upon gospel terms.

In whatever relation it shall please God to place me, I hope to act as one that is sensible, that a faithful discharge of all relative duties is essential to Christianity, and that it is in vain to pretend to religion without it.

If at any time I should go astray, or if any of my brethren should but suspect that I do,—if they will be pleased not to publish their suspicions to the world, but bring them directly to me, with their reason for them, I hope God will give me grace to reform upon the first conviction. But if they should be mistaken, and I should see no reason to condemn myself, I should nevertheless, return them my Christian thanks for their godly jealousy, and act afterwards, as I see reason.

I feel methinks, a passionate inclination to cry out with Peter, "Though all men should forsake thee, yet would not I." But I remember Peter fell. I

can only add (and thou Lord knowest thy servant,) I hope, though "bonds and imprisonments" should "abide me," for the cause of Christ and the gospel; "none of these things should move me:" neither would "I count my life dear," so I "may finish my cause with joy" and faithfulness, and the ministry I am about to receive.

No. II.

Extracts from Letters.

To Mr. John Force*,

Aswick, 5th May, 1721.

N. B. After an account of difficulties in his ministry, he concludes thus:

But whatever changes I am yet to pass through, I know it cannot be long, and I hope I shall soon be above all the vicissitudes of time and chance, which happen to all men. I have not altogether escaped my share in the hatred, nor have been utterly destitute of the love of changeable men. But what is their love or hate to that of the unchangeable God, "whose I am, and whom I serve." I hope, I take no anxious thought for to-morrow; but labour to do my duty, leaving futurity and events to him, who knows how to rule them all, so that none of his shall be losers by them. And yet I have been so used to put cases to myself, and erect imaginary scenes of trial from all quarters, and in all forms that I can think of, not to terrify but to season and prepare my mind to bear them the better, if they should any of them be real; (I have been so used to this) that I am apt to say somewhat like what Æneas did to the Sybil:

——Non ulla laborum,
O Virgo, nova mî facies inopinâve surgit:
Omnia præcepi, atque animo mecum antè peregi.

Æneid, L. vi. v. 103.

Let me quickly hear from you. Write me a long letter; for while I am reading, I am as it were with you. O! that we could live together! but I trust we shall in those soft realms, to which we haste, above, where all the springs are joy, and all the mansions love.

To a kinswoman, the wife of a minister, on her recovery from sickness.

Colcford, 15th Feb. 1722.

I cannot but hope and believe, that God who is the "length of our days," will be so merciful to my good brother in this day of visitation and affliction, as to give back the wife of his bosom into his arms again; as thanks be to his holy name, he has done to me. Since it was necessary now more than ever, that we should be crucified to the world and dead to its enjoyments, in comparison of those spiritual joys, which must be the life of our renewed souls, and give the relish to all other comforts; it may be, God saw it necessary for us, that we should be tried to the very extremity, before he interposed in mercy; and that we should be brought to resign our dearest comforts, and to learn to enjoy them more as precarious and dependent *streams* of consolation, which the God of all consolation can in a moment dry up; and not as *springs* and *fountains*, which we are to expect ever to flow, as we are too apt to judge of all earthly enjoyments. I hope God has carried you by the borders of the valley of the shadow of death, that life may be the less esteemed and yet better enjoyed. For certainly we lose that comfort, which we might have in these inferior things, by our over-rating them. But when we are brought to resign them all in our hearts, before they are ravished from our arms, every day's possession will have a quicker relish and a purer one too. For then we consider not only the *intrinsic value*, but we consider them as so *many tokens of love* also from our heavenly Father. With this frame of spirit, and always seasoned with this view of each other, may you and my *very* dear friend and brother live many years in "the light of God's countenance," and the joys of his "*loving kindness*, which are better" than life! For you "to live, may it be Christ," and "to die, unspeakable again." Let us "live" here "by the faith of the Son of God," and "feel the power of his resurrection," and ascension "in newness of life," and mounting up after him in our desires and affections, be united to him in the bonds of ardent, constraining love, and seated "together with him in heavenly places," in our close, frequent and exalted contemplation, and feel every day the weights drop off from our encumbered, and as yet too earthly souls, which are but spirits in prison! and then whoever dies first of us, will have inexpressibly the best of it.

---

* A minister at Bovey, near Exeter.

No. III.

Biographical Notices of some persons, whose names occur in the foregoing Memoirs.

1. Rev. FRANCIS HUBERT, the maternal grandfather of Mr. STOGDON, was a man of great piety and of wonderful patience under worldly crosses and trials, of which he had a considerable share. He received his classical learning at Westminster school, and was afterwards a commoner of Baliol College in Oxford. His first settlement as a minister, was at Monkton and Barwick, villages in Wiltshire, one mile distant from each other; and he preached at one in the morning and the other in the afternoon. In 1662, he removed to Oxford. On the passing of the Five Mile Act, he went and settled at Witney, where he preached privately till Charles's indulgence, when he had a place licensed. He died 20th October, 1676, aged 49. His ministry was suspended once only by an imprisonment of half a year, which he bore with great chearfulness. He had a right to an advowson of 100l. per annum, which was left in the hands of a friend in special trust for him; but he not conforming, it was sold. He was satisfied however, that God would provide for him and his, and he was not disappointed in his expectation. In his last sickness, he told the physician, he sent for him, because he thought it his duty to use means; but not because he was fond of life, or fearful of death. "For" he said, "through grace I can say, it is no more to me to die, than to undress and go to bed." Calamy's Abridgment, vol. ii. p. 762. or, Palmer's "Nonconformist's Memorial," vol. ii. p. 498.

2. STANDEN, BOWDEN, BILLINGSLEY. Little information can be obtained concerning these gentlemen, by the writer of these pages. Mr. Standen was settled at Newbury; in the year 1726, he conformed. Mr. Bowden was pastor for many years of a congregation at Frome. There is in print a charge by him, delivered to Mr. afterwards Dr. Thomas Morgan, author of "The Moral Philosopher," at his ordination at Frome, 6th Sept. 1716: To which is prefixed a sermon, on 2 Cor. iv. 1, 2. on the same occasion by Mr. Billingsley. The name of this gentleman is revived, and will be transmitted through some years to come, by these Memoirs, as the friend of free inquiry, and as the patron of Dr. Foster and Mr. Stogdon, whose house afforded to them, in the early days of their ministry, an asylum, when religious imposition and rancour drove them from Devonshire. The sermon referred to breathes a candid and liberal spirit, and carries in it agreeable traits of a respectable character.

"Let *me*" says Mr. Billingsley, "rather die than that I should, to serve any turn of life, or a party, misrepresent either the principles, or practices of any of my brethren or neighbours; rather than ascribe such persuasions to them, as I know they constantly disown; though they best know their own thoughts, and have as much right to be believed in the professions they make, as I have in mine."——"We must not decline what we think a necessary publication of a truth or duty; though by it we must condemn a former opinion, which we stiffly maintained; and give an evidence that we *could be mistaken*. We must not decline it, because it will expose our follies and imperfections. I must not hide what I consider as important truth, because it should discover some hidden thing of dishonesty in me, lest it should cross my *interest* or a *design* which I have on foot, by putting my hearers on some duty or other, which is not very favourable to it. If I walk in craftiness, and my design be for instance, to kindle or blow up the coals of contention, to boil up the rage of a party, to gratify my pride, ambition, covetousness, revenge, or any other foolish and hurtful lust: in that case I may perhaps, be afraid of so much as reading to my hearers the excellent sermon of our Lord on the mount, his last sermon and prayer, or indeed almost any thing he ever said or did, that is left on record in the gospel; the first Epistle of John, particularly the 3d and 4th chapters of it; or 1 Cor. xiii. or Rom. xiv. I may be loath, that such sounds as these, should ever reach their ears: God is love: He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God. Love your enemies. Charity suffereth long and is kind. He that hateth his brother is a murderer. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. Who art thou, that judgest thy brother? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Judge not that ye be not judged. Forbearing one another in love. Sometimes one part of God's word is suppressed, that people may not see how much they have

been abused in other parts of it. And those truths, which grate on darling corruptions, are kept back for fear of displeasing. But we must not thus handle the word of God deceitfully" ——"A scrap of it shall be divided from the rest, no notice taken of the nature and design of the discourse to which it belonged, and a foreign, perhaps a quite contrary sense, shall be annexed to the sound of it. An obscure passage, so in itself, or made so, shall be set up in contradiction to the holy, just and merciful nature of God and the whole stream of the scriptures. A text of peace shall serve to furnish out a proclamation of war; and the most abominable things be recommended from it in the name of God."

Scanty as is the biography of a Standen, Bowden and Billingsley, the reputation of acting consistently with the principles of Protestant Dissenters, attaches to their names, in the affair of Mr Stogdon's ordination, from whom others had withheld their testimony of friendship and fellowship, because he refused to subscribe to the articles which they prescribed as a test of true faith. Mr. Billingsley found it proper to vindicate his own conduct, on this occasion, in an appendix to a discourse entitled "Rational and Christian Principles the best rules of conduct." To such as are acquainted with the history of the Trinitarian controversy in his day, and with the manner in which it was conducted, there will appear in the passages that have been quoted, a propriety, point and force, that do credit to Mr. Billingsley's judgment and integrity.

3. Another name mentioned in the preceding Memoirs is that of Mr. JOHN WITHERS; of whom a gentleman who was his contemporary has left it on record, that "he was a hater of priests and of priestcraft, and a very worthy, learned man." He was one of the ministers of the three dissenting congregations at Exeter, first in connection with Mr. Joseph Hallet, Sen. and Mr. Peirce, and after Mr Hallet's death, with the last gentleman and Mr. John Lavington, till Mr. Peirce was ejected. Mr. Withers was chosen into this connection in 1705. When the ministers, who took an active part in fomenting the Trinitarian controversy, proposed that this declaration, "I believe the Father, word and spirit to be one God," should be set up as a test of Orthodoxy, he offered his reasons against it, in a speech prepared for the purpose. The substance of his reasons were; that to bring in such a test was contrary to the good old rule, allowed by all divines and lawyers, "That no man is bound to accuse himself;" applicable in his opinion, as properly to errors in judgment as to crimes in practice: that the declaration was no other than a discriminating test, which would mark those who declined it with infamy, and to require it was an infringement of the common liberties of mankind, an inquisition into men's consciences, a ransacking of their minds and a piece of ecclesiastical tyranny: that it would condemn the puritans for refusing, and justify their adversaries for imposing the oath *ex officio*; which was enjoined by those, who if they had no reason, had more authority to support their requisition: and, that it would be introductory to other innovations, opening the way for one test this year and another the next, and giving a sanction to every man who could set up as the head of a party, to make a new creed.

Mr. Withers objected also to the proposed declaration in itself, as the expression was not to be found in the ancient creeds, which owned the Father and Son to be one in nature, but declined calling them one God: that the words were those of one of the most notorious heretics Paulus Samosatenus, Patriarch of Antioch, and would countenance those who embraced the Sabellian notion *.

Mr. Withers, at a subsequent assembly of ministers, was called upon to deliver his ideas on the doctrine of the Trinity, and he declared himself in his own words. When Mr. Peirce and Mr. Joseph Hallet, Jun. were, on the ground of their supposed Arianism, ejected from their pastoral connections, Mr. Withers was at first implicated in the same sentence of exclusion: but afterwards he was received again by his congregation. In this connection he died.

"He was well known," says Mr. Peirce, "by his excellent writings†." The titles only will shew to what objects of utility and importance the talents and pen of Mr. Withers were de-

* Peirce's "Western Inquisition," p. 79—83. † Ibid. p. 11.

voted. He expressed his zeal and interest in the affairs of the nation by a sermon, entitled, "The Perjury and Folly of the late Rebellion," preached at Exon, June 7, 1716; and by another delivered March 1, 1720, on "the Pestilence abroad and the prosperity of our affairs at home." A Charge 21st August, 1722, at the ordination of Mr. Micajah Towgood, appeared also from the press. He was likewise the author of the following Tracts in the cause of liberty. I. The Whigs vindicated; the Objections commonly brought against them answered; and the present ministry proved to be the best friends to the monarchy, the lasting peace and the real welfare of England: in a letter to a friend. N. B. This Tract reached to an eleventh edition. It was favourable to the views of the powers *that were*. II. Remarks on Dr. Walker's late Preface to his *Attempt*, &c. Wherein the Whigs and Dissenters are vindicated from the many aspersions cast upon them in the said Preface. There was a second edition of this piece. III. The History of Resistance, as practised by the church of England. In which it is proved from the most authentic records, that in every reign, since the reformation of religion, the said church hath aided and assisted, justified and approved of such subjects as have defended themselves against the oppressions of their tyrannical though natural princes. Written in defence of the late revolution, the present establishment and the Protestant succession. In the year 1715, there appeared a seventh edition of this tract. IV. A vindication of the Dissenters from the charge of rebellion, and being the authors of our civil wars: proving from the most authentic historians, 1. That the unhappy war between king Charles I. and his parliament began principally upon a civil and military, not a religious account. 2. That the most eminent leading men, who first engaged in the parliament quarrel, were *Conformists*, and men of episcopal principles. 3. That the *Presbyterians* did oppose that king's murder. And 4. That they did contribute their good offices towards the restoration of king Charles II. This piece was first published in 1710, as a preservative against the virulent suggestions of a clergyman in the city of Exeter, whose constant business it was to represent the Dissenters as implacable enemies to monarchy and the church. In 1719, there was a call in London, for a second impression of it. Mr. Withers likewise, in vindication of the Dissenters, was engaged in a controversy, which ran through several pamphlets, with Mr. Agate, a clergyman of the city of Exeter.

A list like this of publications, that have been long since obsolete, may appear to some dry and uninteresting. But it has its uses: it shows how the talents and time of a person have been employed; which is of service to ascertain in a degree, the turn of his mind and his character. It is a register of the questions, that have been formerly discussed, as the state of things or rising events have agitated the passions, or stimulated the intellectual powers of men. And it contributes to form and complete the literary history of past times.

The writer of this regrets, that he has not materials to furnish a more full biography of Mr. Withers; and that it had not occurred to his friend Mr. Manning, when he gave the public a sketch of the life and writings of Mr. Micajah Towgood, that it would have added to the interest and importance of his work, had he availed himself of the opportunity to have paid a biographical tribute of respect to the memory of such men, as Mr. Withers, Mr. Stephen Towgood and Mr. Merivale, who had been connected with the subject of his sketch.

No. IV.

Trinitarian Controversy and Exeter Assembly.

Frequent reference has been made in the preceding pages to the Trinitarian Controversy and the Exeter Assembly. This association consisting of the ministers of the counties of Devon and Cornwall we are told "* was formed in 1656, for the purpose of brotherly counsel and advice, without pretending to exercise any church censures, but only to assist, advise and encourage each other in propagating truth and holiness." If this representation be correct, and it was not originally a part of the Presbyterian hierarchy established in England, in the time of the republic, and armed with the power of the state, it grossly deviated from its first unassuming friendly

* Manning's Life of Towgood, p. 11.

design, when the Trinitarian controversy arose. It is owned indeed, that it examined the testimonials of candidates for the ministry and appointed ordainers*. This was I conceive, arrogating to themselves power and authority, which, if innocently used at first, in after-times and for a succession of years, was much abused. At the assembly in 1718, it was put to the vote, "Whether the members of it should make any declaration in that assembly, concerning the errors relating to the doctrine of the holy Trinity!" This was resolved in the affirmative. Some of the ministers indeed, who were against impositions and determining matters by mere authority, thought the making of a declaration neither necessary nor expedient, and desired that the expediency of it might be calmly and fairly debated, as they had several reasons to offer against it. But it happened then, as it commonly happens in such meetings: for though these judicious members struggled hard to obtain this point, which they observed, was not only reasonable in itself, but agreeable to their method of proceeding in all their former assemblies, yet they were borne down by noise and numbers. They could not by all their importunity, obtain leave to offer their reasons; their proposals were slighted and their voices drowned. Some of them were rudely interrupted, others reflected on and menaced. Finding therefore that they could not be allowed so much as to propose their reasons for not making such a declaration, they remonstrated against these violent, arbitrary and irregular proceedings, as well as against the cabals and intrigues which some had used to obtain a majority and to compass their ends†.

In a subsequent assembly, May 5, 1719, (for the controversy and attempts to carry their impositions, were kept up for a succession of years, by these divines,) the first article of the church of England, either as a more explicit avowal of their sentiments, or as deriving weight and authority from its being the dogma of the national and established religion, was adopted as a declaration of their faith concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, and to avoid the charge of having departed from the commonly received faith. But these gentlemen, not satisfied with making a *voluntary* declaration, as it was called, of their own faith, passed also a resolution, "That they could not in conscience give their approbation of any person's being admitted to preach as a candidate, or to be ordained or recommended by them to any congregation, unless he professed his assent to the above article, or to the answers of the fifth and sixth questions of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism.‡"

It is to be observed, that when at the assembly in 1718, the moderator and several others desired that this question, viz. "Shall a declaration in words of scripture be accepted as orthodox," should be put to the vote, it could by no means be obtained§. The consequences of these synodical proceedings and of the feuds created at Exeter in particular, by setting up an inquisition into the faith of particular ministers, were lamentable divisions and animosities excited through the country, by emissaries sent either to insinuate suspicions of the orthodoxy of ministers, or to spread aspersions of their character. For many years a claim to judge and determine of the qualifications of candidates for the ministry, by the aforesaid test, was asserted and maintained; but the force of the resolution of 1719, appears to have gradually died away, till an attempt to revive the efficiency of it at the assembly in May 1753, failing, this assumed authority has never reared its head again.

The question then put was:

"Whether the assembly shall recommend any candidate to ordination, who will not declare his faith in the deity of the Son and Holy Ghost?" And it was debated, whether the above question should be put or not?

Yes, said Mr. Waldron, Exeter.
Mr. Giles,
Mr. Lavington, Exeter.
Mr. Pitts, Topsham.
Mr. Orchard, Chudleigh.
Mr. Weeler, Axminster.
Mr. Waldron, Jun. Barnstaple.
Mr. Walters,
Mr. Baller, Barnstaple.

* Manning's Life of Towgood, p. 11.

† Peirce's "Western Inquisition," p. 84, 85.

‡ Account of what was transacted in the assembly of the united ministers of Devon and Cornwall, Exon, May 5 and 6, 1719.

§ Peirce's "Western Inquisition."

No, Mr. Towgood, Exeter.
Mr. Merivale, Tavistock.
Mr. Follet.
Mr. John Kiddel, Tiverton; yet living, at Hackney.
Mr. Reynell, Totness.
Mr. Harris, Luppit, near Honiton*.
Mr. Adams, Dartmouth.
Mr. Short, near Barnstaple.
Mr. Rutter, Honiton.
Mr. Benj. Kiddel, Sidmouth.
Mr. Wreyford,
Mr. Bartlett, Sidbury.

No, Mr. Fabian, Newton Bushell.
Mr. Castle, Oakhampton.
Suspenders, Mr. Hancock, Limston.
Mr. Charler †,
Mr. Wills, Ilfracomb.

N. B. The above question and names, except with the addition of the places, where the gentlemen ministered, were handed lately to me by my much esteemed friend, the Rev. Joseph Bretland, of Exeter.

27th. Oct. 1808. J. T.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

ORIGINAL LETTER OF DR. WATTS'S TO MR. STOGDON.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

On reading the Memoirs of Mr. Stogdon in your two last numbers, I recollected that I had in my possession the copy of a letter written to that gentleman, by the celebrated Dr. WATTS, in consequence of receiving from him a MS. relating to the doctrine of the Trinity. As your readers may be gratified by the perusal of it, I send it to you to be inserted in your next number, by way of supplement to the Memoirs. Of its authenticity you need not doubt. Indeed the internal evidence will be satisfactory to such as are acquainted with the doctor's sentiments and spirit. I am your's,

R. L.

SIR,

I take it as a piece of peculiar respect, that you should make a present to me of your letter in manuscript, and deny yourself the satisfaction of your designed publication: and that merely upon the slight notice given you by my bookseller, of some further dissertations which I design to publish on the doctrine of the Trinity. If you think I have delayed too long to make my acknowledgements to you, yet I am persuaded you'll imagine it a sufficient excuse when I tell you, that the day before I received your manuscript, I had a large pamphlet put into my hands in answer to my little book of the Trinity, which was published three days after, and which you may easily suppose has busied my thoughts, and employed the few hours of health which I enjoy.

I thankfully receive sir, the great candour and respect with which your epistle treats me, and make this free confession to you, that the greatest part of your manuscript speaks much of my sense and thought concerning the doctrine of charity, and if those arguments had been published alone to the world, and concluded with that most solemn and pious account of your friend in the three last pages, without any regard to my book, I would assure you sir, you should have found no answer from me, for I confess I cannot refute them.

I might also tell you that there is some truth in this paragraph of yours, (viz.) "In short you seem to me to

* Afterwards Dr. Harris, the author of several valuable historical works, written with great impartiality and judgment.

† This name is perhaps a mistake, for Mr. Churlyof of Ufculme.

have resolved to offend the one party as little as could possibly consist with pleasing the other, and keeping your conscience between both; though you durst never say expressly that your notion of the Trinity is necessary to salvation, &c. Yet you convey your charity with such a secret hand, &c."

Truly sir, I think this is but an observance of the rule of the great apostle 1 Cor. x. 32, 33. Give none offence neither to the Jews nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God; neither to the zealous Athanasians, nor to the Arians, nor to the pious Christians of any party whatsoever. As there are some seasons wherein that advice of the apostle is necessary, Rom. xiv. 22. *Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God:* So there are some seasons also wherein a parallel advice is as proper, *Hast thou charity? have it to thyself before God.* But I hope these seasons are growing to an end.

Surely sir, you know so well the present temper of many Christians, that it is necessary for any man, that would attempt to enlarge their charity, that he should make it appear first that he himself is sound in the faith, according to their judgment of things. Till this is done, whatever he shall say upon the principles and duties of love will be vain and insignificant: for they imagine that the author hath need of charity for himself, and therefore he bespeaks it. Now since I am well satisfied in the general doctrine that true and proper godhead is ascribed to our Lord Jesus Christ and the holy spirit in many places of scripture, I was willing first to make that appear with such strength and evidence as I could in a few plain pages, and set what I think is truth in the most convincing light, though I am doubtful of the common schemes of explication. And I thought it enough in that book to lay down some principles and foundations of charity, without drawing out the inferences at large. The 247th page of my book expresses the same sentiments with the 21st and 22nd propositions, even though your notions of communion in or with godhead may not arise so high as mine do

If I have in any expressions betrayed an uncharitable spirit, I hope the world will forgive what I myself do not approve, and will understand those words in a sense no more severe than what I had when I wrote them, which I shall shew immediately. And as I hope I have been enabled to do something in that book towards the establishment of the truth, so if I can find that the world will bear it, I trust God will enable me to do some further service in the propagation of charity in due time. I have some dissertations of that kind by me at present, but I would willingly delay and manage my publication of them in such a manner that they might have the best influence upon those pious souls whose charity is too narrow. And I pray God to direct and guide my thoughts and determinations for this purpose. In the pursuit of this design if I should ever have occasion to cite some pages of yours hereafter, as received in a private letter from an unknown hand, I persuade myself that you will be pleased to see it used in so happy a design: but I can determine nothing yet.

And now sir, I have spoken my sentiments of charity with so much freedom, give me leave also to add, that if our Lord Jesus Christ be the true God, or has the fulness of the godhead dwelling bodily in him, so as to make one complex person or principle of action and passion, as I verily believe he has, then I do not think it a matter of small importance whether we believe his godhead or no. Though my charity can extend itself towards persons who are honest, humble and sincere in their search, and pray earnestly for divine assistance, even to such persons as you describe in the end of your letter, yet I think they ought to have a most solemn awe upon their own spirits, lest they should degrade that glorious person from his oneness with the Father in true godhead, whom so many ages of Christians have believed to be truely one with God, according to his own expression, *I and the Father are one.* And in my opinion the glory of his mediation, the all-sufficience of his atonement, the Almighty prevalence of his intercession, his power to send the holy spirit, and to govern the known and unknown worlds depend upon his divinity, or the union of the man Jesus to the eternal godhead, constituting one person or one complex principle of action. It awakens therefore, a sort of religious horror, when some persons seem to take pleasure in a contemptuous debasing of the character of our blessed Lord, and roundly assert that Christ is but a mere creature, and that he is called God only for the same reason that angels or magistrates are

called gods, or as the devil himself is called the god of this world. I wish these things were laid to heart by all who profess sober and pious enquiries into the truth. I own sir I find nothing like this sort of language in your letter.

But there are two or three things in your epistle which I particularly take occasion to remark, partly to declare my agreement with you, and partly to shew my different thoughts.

You observe sir, that I use the words *necessary honours*, and *due honours*, paid to the Son and Spirit in such a cautious manner, as though I did not mean them explicative of each the other, but in a different sense, p. 245 and 246. Indeed sir, you are perfectly in the right, for I cannot call all those honours which are due to our Lord Jesus Christ, as he has communion in the divine nature, to be necessary to our salvation, and it is obvious enough to every thoughtful reader.

You observe again sir, and you own that you are a little warm there, that I levelled that text 2 Pet. ii. 1. against my brethren, which my conscience tells me does not belong to them, (viz.) *damnable heresies denying the Lord that bought them.* And you say that it stands in my book, temptingly offering itself to that unrighteous service. Now sir, I dare freely confess that I do not believe that scripture particularly refers to those that deny the godhead of Christ, but probably to those who deny him as a holy governor of his people, or at least in general to those that deny him in any of those powers, properties, offices, or characters, the belief of which is necessary to salvation, and I wish upon second thoughts that I had so explained it

But however without such a paraphrase, I think I have not given such just reason as you suppose, to apply it directly and peculiarly to those that deny the deity of Christ; for when the first part of my book is spent in proving the deity of Christ and the spirit, the second part of my book in proving their personality, and the third or last part in proving their several offices and relations in which they stand to us; and upon a recapitulation I make this conclusion, that there are such things as damnable heresies when persons deny the Lord that bought them; this should with much more justice be referred to the denial of all or any of the preceeding properties, characters or offices of Christ, the belief of which is necessary to salvation, and not merely confined to the doctrine of his deity.

You ask me sir, how we shall know a seeming contradiction from a real one. I reply that by a seeming contradiction I mean that which at first sight appears so, but after due inspection and enquiry cannot be plainly and clearly proved to be a contradiction. And whatever you may imagine, concerning some of the known and common schemes of explication of the doctrine of the Trinity, (which yet I can by no means give up,) yet I intreat you to believe that there is or may be some uncommon or unknown scheme of explication which may not be a contradiction; and I cannot part with this doctrine, which seems to me so plainly revealed in scripture, till the doctrine itself be either directly disproved from the word of God, or till all possible schemes of explication, (both known and unknown,) are either actually refuted or precluded.

I further add, that if ever my book of the Trinity should live to another edition, I should make you sensible that I lie ever open to conviction, and should make some corrections, for which you and others have given me proper hints and just occasion, and for which I return my acknowledgements.

To conclude sir, the civility and reasoning of your letter deserves a larger and better answer than my want of health and many other necessary engagements will at present allow, and if besides all, the candour of your writing, you allow me to suppose that yourself are the person described in the three last pages of your epistle, my esteem and respect for you is doubled. That God would send (guide) you and me and every enquiring Christian into the firm belief of all important truths, and the constant practice of holiness and love, is the hearty prayer of Sir,

Your humble servant,

August 4, 1722. I. W.

P. S. I do not forbid a prudent communication of this letter, yet I intreat you would admit no copy of it, but treat it as I do your MSS. according to our Saviour's rule, Matt. vii. 12.

*** It does not appear that Mr. Stogdon violated this injunction, but it is supposed that the original letter fell into the hands of his survivors among other papers, and that the above was a transcript from it. The copies of some others are yet in being. R. I.

AN ARGUMENT AGAINST PRAYING TO CHRIST.

I believe, it is admitted by all parties of Christians, that the true worshippers of God, under the Jewish dispensation, prayed to no being but the Father, who was known to them as the one Jehovah, the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob. Had Jesus been sent to change the object of religious worship, to introduce a new object of religious worship, on a point of such vast importance, he would certainly have expressed himself in the most explicit manner; but so far from this being the case, he never intimated any such design: on the contrary, he and his apostles sanctioned, and taught in the plainest manner, the doctrine of Moses and the prophets respecting the object of Worship. No practice did the Jewish law more pointedly and positively condemn than the offering of religious worship to any being but the one Jehovah, nor was there any point of which the Jews, in the days of Christ and his apostles, were more tenacious: yet we never find them charging him with introducing any object of worship contrary to the law, or with receiving religious worship himself, though had he done it, no doubt they would have proceeded against him on that ground, and he would have been condemned to death, according to the strict letter of the law. No charge of this kind being brought against him, is a full proof that he countenanced no deviation from the exclusive worship of the one Jehovah. No charge of this kind being brought against the apostles is a proof that they did not pray to Christ, or teach others to pray to him, or to any being but the Father.

April 8, 1809. W.

DECISIONS OF COMMON SENSE, ON THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN. LETTER II *.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, *May* 28, 1808.

Regarding the scriptures as the only sure guide to religious truth, and common sense as the expositor, which every Christian is capable of consulting at all times, I have carefully examined those interesting records in reference to the doctrine of original sin, and now send you the decisions of common sense, founded on such scriptural examination of the subject.

Supposing the doctrine of original sin to be true, and that it occupies the important and leading place in the system of Christian truth, which many Christians have allotted it, by representing it as having rendered necessary the mediation of Christ, and the great work of Christian redemption; it was natural for me to conclude that Jesus, whom I had learned to revere, as the greatest of teachers and the most glorious

* For Letter I. see M. Repos. vol. iii. p. 196.

of all the messengers of God, had plainly taught it, and that a particular statement of it might be expected in the history which the Evangelists wrote of his life and doctrine. Think sir, what was my surprise, when after reading the four Evangelists with close attention, I found that the great master of Christians, who erected the standard of their faith, never so much as mentioned, or even hinted at the sin of Adam, the supposed natural depravity of his posterity, nor in any form either taught, or so much as intimated the doctrine of original sin or hereditary depravity; but on the contrary, taught what is utterly irreconcileable with that doctrine; that he taught that the sins of men proceed entirely from themselves, and fall with all their consequences, upon their own heads. It appeared to me very strange, if Jesus knew that all moral depravity was derived by generation, and descended from Adam, he should trace the evil actions of men no farther than the perversity of individuals and the corrupt principles they had imbibed or formed, leaving the supposed original and universal source of moral corruption unnoticed. This appeared to me the more extraordinary, as I had observed a contrary conduct to be pretty general among the advocates for original sin; that they seldom, if ever, speak particularly of the corruption of men's hearts, without intimating, if not plainly expressing its derivation from Adam. Common sense dictated that Jesus Christ could not have the same views of this subject as are entertained by many modern professors of his name; seeing he preserved a total silence when they would have spoken out plainly: and that a doctrine which he never taught, even if true, can be no essential doctrine of Christianity. One thing in particular struck me in the gospel history, which common sense dictated to be fatal to the notion of original sin or hereditary depravity. We read that Jesus took a little child and set it up in the midst of his disciples, and declared that, except they were converted and became like little children, they should in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven: now if little children were altogether corrupt and morally polluted, the unconverted would be more like little children than the converted; instead of sinners becoming like little children by being converted, conversion would render them more unlike such than they were before: it would be absurd to suppose Jesus to hold up a creature radically corrupt, whose very nature was morally depraved, as a pattern of what men must become in order to their entering the kingdom of heaven; it would be supposing him to make radical corruption and moral depravity, essential qualifications in those who would enter his kingdom. It appears to common sense, that the notion of original sin impeaches the conduct of Christ, as it supposes him to hold up a depraved, guilty creature, under the curse of God, as a pattern of converted men, and the subjects of the heavenly kingdom. Had he only been silent on the subject, his silence ought to have been respected, and to have restrained us from asserting as an essential doctrine of Christianity,

what he never taught; but as he plainly asserted what is incompatible with the notion of original sin, that notion appears to common sense as more than doubtful and suspicious, it appears to be a great error and corruption.

In opposition to my reasoning upon the gospels, I have been told, that Jesus was silent upon some points which his apostles plainly taught afterwards. Though the manner in which this has been asserted seems to degrade Christ, and represent him as an imperfect preacher of the gospel in comparison of his apostles, which is a manifest inconsistency, for they received all their information from him, I have been led carefully to examine the Acts of the apostles, to see whether they, after the exaltation of their Lord, taught this supposed fundamental of religion, original sin; and I find they were as silent upon the subject as he had been before them. Throughout the book of Acts, the sin of Adam is never mentioned, nor is the least hint dropped about the natural depravity of man, or his being born sinful and incapable of doing the will of God; on the contrary, the Apostles charged the sins of both Jews and Gentiles upon them, as originating with themselves, without ever referring to a corrupt nature derived from Adam, as the source of all their crimes. Common sense can discover nothing in the *Acts* which gives the least countenance to the doctrine of original sin; the addresses of the Apostles to both Jews and Gentiles, as recorded there, evidently proceed on a contrary principle.

Often have I heard preachers insisting on the necessity of conversion and the new birth, on account of the corrupt, depraved state in which all are born; and they have talked as if they thought that had man been born pure his own conduct would not have rendered his conversion necessary; for the corruption of nature has been their favourite topic when urging upon sinners that they must be converted and born again. On this conduct of some popular preachers common sense has suggested, that they talked as if men's conversion was made necessary by what they could not help, not by their own improper conduct, and as if God, by a constitution of things which he had fixed, had caused them to be made as individuals in so bad a state, that it was rendered impossible they should be morally good until he had new made them. If the views of such men were just, common sense would be unable to account for the conduct of Jesus and his Apostles; as he and they, when speaking of the new birth, conversion, &c. made not the least reference to Adam's sin, nor dropped the least hint respecting the supposed natural corruption of mankind.

I find but one writer in the New Testament, who makes any mention of Adam's sin; that writer is Paul; and he mentions it incidentally, to illustrate other subjects; not as a doctrine which he was commissioned to teach, or as making any part of the Christian doctrine; but as a thing understood among the Jews, and which served to elucidate what he was writing. The passages in

which Paul refers to the sin of Adam are the following:

Rom. v. 12——19. Of which passage common sense dictates the following to be the meaning. Adam was the first sinner; death commenced with him; from him it passed to his posterity, human nature having ever since been mortal; all men are placed under the sentence of condemnation pronounced on the first man, i. e. *dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return.* These things Paul brings forward to illustrate the deliverance brought to the world by Jesus Christ. In saying, *By one man's disobedience many were made sinners*, he uses a figurative style, which common sense can discover in his writings and fully discern in the passage, and only means, by their connexion with Adam they were subjected to death, the wages of sin. He does not say that sin passed as mortality does, from one man upon all men, nor that by one man's disobedience many were made sinful, or had a sinful nature communicated to them; though this is what the doctrine of original sin requires he should have said. Common sense must ever revolt at the idea of any person's being made *literally* a sinner by any disobedience but his own; figuratively he may, i. e. he may be adjudged to sufferings; and that for wise and beneficent purposes.

1 Cor. xv. 21, 22. In this place the apostle simply mentions death coming by Adam, to illustrate what he was stating of the communication of life by Jesus Christ.—1 Tim. ii. 14. Here he simply states that not the man but the woman was deceived and first in the transgression. These are all the places in the New Testament, where even an allusion is made to the sin of Adam and its effects.

The following are the decisions of common sense arising from an examination of the New Testament on the doctrine of original sin.

1. Neither Jesus Christ, nor his Apostles taught this doctrine; therefore it is no doctrine of Christianity.

2. As neither Jesus nor his Apostles taught it, its being contrary to reason, and all our natural ideas of justice, is sufficient to authorize its rejection.

3. As it is incompatible with what Jesus and his Apostles taught, it must be false and erroneous.

4. As only one passage in Paul's writings states the effects of Adam's sin, and the style of that is manifestly figurative, it must be highly absurd to attempt to build upon that a doctrine contrary to reason and the general tenor of scripture, especially as the passage will easily bear a different construction.

5. As Paul brings forward what he says about the sin of Adam merely to illustrate other subjects, he might do it, as quoting the general opinion of the Jews on the subject, without giving an absolute sanction to that opinion.

One more Letter shall conclude what I have to say on this subject.

I remain, your's, &c.

RUSTICUS.

TO THE AUTHORS OF THE IMPROVED VERSION.

SIRS,

I am a plain man, and in a humble station in life. But I have long had a very earnest desire to understand the New Testament thoroughly. I have read it often, and have thought over it much. I am convinced that on the whole it teaches the doctrines now called Unitarian. However, I have been much puzzled by several particular texts in our common Bible, which seem directly contrary to them. And, as I cannot suppose that the writers of the New Testament intended to contradict themselves or each other, I am obliged to conclude that these particular texts are either mistranslated or misunderstood. What pleasure then did it give me, to be informed, that a New Version of the New Testament was published; and that this was done by the Unitarian Society in London! Surely thought I, my difficulties will now be all removed, and I shall see the real meaning of these passages which have perplexed me so greatly. As I have not much money to lay out in books, I bought a neat pocket edition of this Version, which was recommended to me as the most convenient for persons in my situation; and set myself with eagerness to read and study it, in hope of receiving full satisfaction from it. How great was my surprise and grief then to find, that some of the opinions I had given up were still held out as really contained in the New Testament, and that the authority of the new translators had confirmed what I expected it would have destroyed! Can it be, said I to myself, that these gentlemen are treading back their steps, and going to turn orthodox again? While I was thinking of these things, a neighbour of mine, a member of a Baptist congregation here, came in one evening, and seeing the New Version open on the table before me, his curiosity led him to look into it, and afterwards to borrow it. When he returned it, I asked him of course what he thought of it? "Think of it!" (said he,) "Why, if you believe that these translators have given the fair meaning of the New Testament, is it possible that you can hold to the Unitarian scheme another day? Do they not tell you, that the word was a god, that the fulness of the deity dwelleth in him bodily, and that he divested himself of the resemblance to God, when he took on him the form of a servant, (if indeed he could divest himself of that which he did not so much as grasp at?) Now neighbour, will you ever again assert that Jesus Christ is not God? And as for other things,—will you ever again find fault with me for giving the title of *Saint* to the Evangelists and Apostles, and call it a mere Popish title, when this very Version teaches you, that the Gospels are according to St. Matthew, &c. and gives you the Epistles of St. Paul, St. Peter, &c.? Will you tell me, that there is no such spiritual being as the Devil or Satan, when you read here, that Jesus was tempted by the Devil or by Satan, that

the Jews were of their father the Devil, that the Son of God was maifested to destroy the works of the Devil, that the Devil taketh away the word out of the hearts of some, that the Devil will flee from us if we resist him, that some persons had turned aside after Satan, but that God will quickly bruise Satan under the feet of his people? Will you talk against the existence of a soul or spirit, when these very translators tell you that the body without the spirit is dead, that God is represented as threatening the rich worldling that his soul should be required of him that night, and that they are not to be feared who are not able to kill the soul? I will ask you but once more, how can you have the assurance to dispute against the eternity of hell torments, when you find it even here, that he who shall blaspheme against the holy spirit is liable to everlasting punishment, and that the wicked in general shall go away into everlasting punishment?" To this he added, "See here what your boasted Unitarian Version teaches! And I could have pointed out many other places, in which it destroys your new fangled creed, and confirms the old orthodox faith. But I will leave you to think of what I have said already." So saying, he went off with an air of most insulting triumph. While I was thinking of all these things, and lamenting that the professed advocates of the Unitarian system should have put such formidable weapons into the hands of their opponents, in comes another neighbour of mine, a steady Unitarian. He saw me perplexed and uneasy; and I told him what had made me so. "Well (says he,) but do you not know that there are two large editions of the New Version, in which there are notes, explaining some of these passages in a manner which (I think) would satisfy you?" "Are there so (said I?) why then have not the publishers added these notes to the small edition?" "To make it a cheap one," said he. "But was it worth while (said I,) for the sake of saving six-pence or a shilling in the price of a copy, to let that very edition, which would be most generally read, go out in such a form as would mislead its readers, and that in some very important points?" "Indeed, my friend (said he;) I lament this as much as you yourself do. But you know, we lately read in the Monthly Repository, a letter from one of the Editors; who says, that they endeavoured to give only an *Improved* Version of the New Testament, not a *perfect* one." "This very thing (said I,) surprizes me most of all. When they were undertaking a work of so much importance to the interest of truth, and a work that is not likely to be undertaken anew in our time; why should they content themselves with giving a version a little better than the old one, and not try to make it as perfect as possible?" "I can no way account for it (answered my neighbour). But what if you were to write to the editors? Perhaps the publisher of the Monthly Repository would insert a letter from you, as he has done some from other hands. What if you were to write to them, to tell them of the injury they have done to their own cause? and to propose it to them, to publish an

appendix to their small edition, which shall contain all the notes that are given in the large ones; and when they publish a second edition of the Version, to correct all those passages which convey wrong views of scripture doctrine, or at least to add the notes in full in their proper places?" To this request I agreed, and thought I could not do better than to write an account of these conversations with my two neighbours. I think it scarce worth while to find fault about That and Who and Which, or even about (what seems to me a breach of grammar) the question "*Who* say ye that I am." That doctrines, which Unitarians must believe to be errors, are countenanced and supported, and even spread farther and wider, by a Unitarian Version, is a great and very mischievous evil. If you, sirs, can see the matter in this light, you will make haste to remedy it. Do but consider that the edition which contains the errors, but does not in general afford what might correct them, is the very edition which will be read the most; and you will I hope, feel the necessity of furnishing us Unitarians of the lower class with that assistance, which may enable us to repel the insolent triumphs of our opponents, and may establish our own minds in the truth. The wish for this assistance is the earnest wish of many others, besides it's being that sirs, of

Your very humble servant,
A Country Schoolmaster.

UNITARIANISM ADAPTED TO THE UNLEARNED.

A minister happening to be in company with an unlearned woman, who had never heard Unitarian preaching, nor conversed with any Unitarian, nor read any Unitarian book but the Bible, on hearing her declare that she did not believe Christ to be God, asked her what had induced her to disbelieve a sentiment so generally received; she replied, that all the ministers she had talked with before had told her she must believe it, but that she read in the New Testament that Christ prayed to God, and obeyed him; from which she concluded that he could not himself be God. This occurred in an obscure village in Yorkshire, about two years since. M.

MR. WYVILL'S INTENDED PETITION.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, *London, May 6.*

The readiness with which you have offered your valuable pages to the discussion of the question, of the emancipation of Dissenters, while it redounds to your credit, will I trust be productive of lasting benefit.

By all parties the present times are described as highly important, whether we regard the foreign relations, or internal situation of the British kingdom. At this instant, the attention of the French ruler appears to be engrossed by objects, that have diverted him from his plan of invading this country; but if we may be allowed to anticipate future events by those that have passed, the time is not far distant, ere he will again collect his forces on the shores of his empire, and renew those threats of invasion, the effects of which must be fresh in the memory of every Englishman.

By the existing laws of this country, a very large proportion of its inhabitants, is declared incapable of bearing arms in its defence: men who are not incapacitated from a want of courage or talent, of zeal or loyalty, but for having avowed it as their opinion, that the civil magistrate has not, nor ever had any right or power over the consciences of men. A cause of incapacity which none perhaps in the present day will be hardy enough to defend, or if any such should be found, these are the persons who would be most loud and bitter in their invectives against every one, who in the hour of danger, should be found to shelter himself behind those disqualifications which they now refuse to repeal, and to withhold his assistance to repel the common enemy.

But while we are regarding our neighbours as political enemies, and preparing our best energies to meet them in the contest, should such a contest be unavoidable; let us not forget to regard them as competitors in a cause in which Britain has long been pre-eminently triumphant. Can any one read that part of the address of the president of the United States of America, in which he congratulates his countrymen on the beneficial result of those equal laws which admit every citizen to participate in all the privileges the community has to offer, can he, while lamenting the miserable state of political servitude, to which the French despot has reduced his empire, contemplate that freedom of religious discussion and worship now admitted, so unusual under former systems of French government; or can he view the havock that is making amidst all the former corrupt and superstitious governments and establishments of Europe; from which the philosophic and reflecting mind, anticipates the most joyous results to the cause of freedom and humanity; and not feel himself animated in that cause, whose aim is to continue to this kingdom, the honourable foremost post we have enjoyed, of encouraging the advance of learning and freedom, and of repelling the insidious attacks of superstition and slavery.

The origin of our restrictive and penal laws was in a period, most disgraceful in the British history; their evil influence was almost instantly experienced; and though in the course of events, they may have tended to keep alive a spirit of inquiry, that has led to the better knowledge of religious rights, no just argument that they should not now be rescinded, can be deduced from this result, so little intended or expected by the framers of them. Seeing that it is impossi-

ble any longer to keep the records of Christianity from men's inquiries, or to fix legal boundaries to the incursions of learning, it is high time to destroy the disgusting restrictions imposed by a profligate and tyrannical party, who conscious of the weakness of their claims, to engross all civil and religious power and emolument, have endeavoured to make up by *law*, what they wanted in point of *right*. If we carry our views to the accession of the house of Brunswick to the British throne, we shall find the claims of the Dissenters to be as strong as the claims of any party in the state; and a sense of the justice of these claims has been publicly acknowledged by many distinguished members of that house. The propriety and justice of our claims of emancipation, has been so often and so ably stated by men, whose talents and integrity, have raised the body of Dissenters to such proud eminence, that it would be most unnecessary and insulting to repeat them; but in some of the late resolutions of our Catholic brethren in Ireland, they have been so forcibly set forth, that every one who bears the honourable title, of advocate for the most extended religious liberty, will find pleasure and profit in perusing them.

If we are agreed in our objects, we have but to consider the time and means most fit to prosecute them. Why I think the present times most favourable, I briefly stated in a letter you honored with a place in your last Repository. I should deem it very desirable, that the application to parliament, or to the king, should be recommended by the body of deputies from the Protestant Dissenters; to which end, those societies who are anxious for emancipation, should assemble to instruct their representatives, in the views and wishes they entertain; at the meeting of the deputies which would be consequent to those instructions, the various views entertained by different societies would be discussed, and one object animating the whole, we might hope such a result as would be compatible with the desires of every society. A petition thus prepared, would receive the signature of those, who feeling they have an arm to defend, and a head and heart to govern their country, are anxious for a free and equal participation of danger and emolument. To those societies who are distant from the metropolis, a plan of the intended petition might be sent, and as they would probably convene an early meeting of their members, the wishes of the Dissenters through the whole country would soon be collected. But if so general a measure is not to be effected, I would not for that cause, the whole should be abandoned, but that a meeting of such, as are friendly to equal laws and liberties should be assembled, when their claims would be stated in such a manner as the majority approved.

Let us not be deterred from the attempt, by the reports so industriously spread, that we cannot at the present moment entertain any just hopes of success, having to oppose determinations long and resolutely maintained in a quarter, from whence if opposition arise, it will be fatal: for not to insist, that these reports are pro-

bably fabrications of men interested in the continuance of error and injustice, if we never make the attempt, we are never likely to succeed, and acquiescence is often obtained by importunity which has been refused to the claims of justice. At all events it will have the beneficial tendency to induce dissenting societies to review their principles and their rights.

But I entertain a very sanguine expectation from the lenient and beneficent spirit, exhibited through the whole reign of the present enlightened monarch of these kingdoms, that he will give our demands his cordial support, and at the latter part of a long reign, communicate the blessings of equal laws, to every denomination of his subjects.

I am sir,

Your's, &c.

G.

TWO ARGUMENTS AGAINST CALVINISM.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, *May* 10, 1809.

There are two presumptive arguments against what is usually styled *the Evangelical system of religion*, that I do not recollect to have seen insisted on with the strength which they admit.

One is the fact that when the apostles of Jesus Christ have occasion to speak of any existing or future corruption of their master's doctrine, they represent it as consisting not in a reduction of articles of religious belief, but in additions to them, not in maintaining and vindicating, but in destroying the simplicity of the gospel. See particularly, 1 Cor. iii. 10, 11. and Coloss. ii.

The remaining consideration to which I have adverted, is likewise, as far as I can judge, a matter of fact—In all those seminaries for the education of dissenting ministers in which no restraints have been laid by subscription or otherwise, upon *inquiry*, the majority of the pupils have not embraced Calvinistic or *Evangelical* sentiments; a result for which I cannot account on the supposition that those opinions are taught in scripture.

To the subjects of this communication I am desirous of drawing the attention of your intelligent readers, and particularly of those among them whose creed is what men term *orthodox*.

I am sir,

Your's, &c.

N.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

REMARKS RESPECTING THE RENDERING OF 1 COR. i. 2. &c. IN THE IMPROVED VERSION, VIZ. 'WHO ARE CALLED BY THE NAME OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.'

The following remarks are principally designed as supplemental to the statements in the Review of the I. V. (p. 220. col. 2.) and are referred to in the continuation of that article in the present number.

The expression translated in the Common Version, 'who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,' is by many considered as a direct proof, that the first Christians prayed to him; and if this were the fact, it may be thought to justify prayer to Christ in these days. Neither the common rendering, nor the inference from it, is called for by the apostle's words. In endeavouring to prove this, as we have chiefly in view the difficulties of those who cannot examine the original for themselves, we shall state the case with as much plainness as we can.

The original words taken unconnectedly, admit of four renderings;—1. *Actively*, 'to all who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ:'—2. Also *actively*, 'to all who appeal to the name of our Lord Jesus Christ:'—3. *Passively*, 'to all who are called by [or according to] the name of our Lord Jesus Christ:'—4. With the *middle* force, 'to all who call upon themselves, [or take upon themselves,] the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.' The cause of the ambiguity is, that the present tense of the verb in question, may be either middle or passive: if *middle*, it requires the 1st. or 2d. or 4th. rendering; if passive, it requires the 3d. rendering.

In favour of the *first*, it is to be observed, that the verb in this doubtful form is generally used in the Greek translation of the O. T. in this sense; and perhaps always so in this connexion, (with 'the name of the Lord' after it:) and that in the N. T. it is several times used in this sense, viz. Acts vii. 59. Rom. x. 12. 2 Cor. i. 23. 2 Tim. ii. 22. 1 Pet. i. 17.

The *second* is an unusual rendering; but it is somewhat authorized by Acts xxv. 11. where Luke records the words of Paul, 'I appeal to Cæsar:' and it should be observed that Luke and Paul only use the phrase in question.

In favour of the *third* rendering it may be urged, that the verb in this doubtful form is used seven times in the writings of Luke with the passive force, (viz. Luke xxii. 3. Acts x. 5, 18, 32. xi. 13. xii. 12. xv. 22;) and once in the Epistle to the Hebrews, xi. 16: and that with the exception of Acts ii. 21. vii. 59. (and probably) xxii. 16. Luke always uses the verb in this sense, or in the second.

In favour of the *fourth* it may be said, that the language admits of it; but we are not aware that there is any scriptural evidence

for it, except Gen. iv. 26. where instead of 'then began men to call upon the name of the Lord,' the sense seems to require the marginal rendering of the English Version, viz. 'to call themselves by the name of the Lord.'

On the whole then, the evidence arising from the scriptural use of the *verb*, rests principally with the 1st. and 3d. renderings; and as far as the customary use merely of precisely this *phrase* is concerned, the evidence decidedly favours the first. We find indeed several phrases very nearly resembling it, such as Gen. xlviii. 16. 'my name shall be called on them*;' Deut. xxviii. 10. 'that the name of the Lord has been called on thee;' 2 Chron. vii. 14. 'upon whom my name is called;' Is. xliii, 7. 'as many as have been called by thy name,' where the noun differs only in case from the instances in question, and where the phrase, as in several other places in the O. T. denotes those who owned the authority of God: but no instance appears in the O. T. in which precisely this form of expression is used in the sense of the 3d rendering.

When we come however to the point of *fact* the state of the case becomes different. If the first rendering be preferred in consequence of the *use* of the phrase in the Septuagint, then must also the *meaning* of the phrase in the Septuagint be employed, and it must be maintained that Luke and Paul speak of the Christians as those who call upon our Lord Jesus Christ as the object of religious worship. Now unless the phrase itself (which all must admit to be fully capable of a different meaning,) prove the point, we have no ground to believe that the first Christians did so. Several instances occur in which the disciple had sensible intercourse with his exalted Lord; others, in which praise and glory are ascribed to him; and still more, in which devout wishes are expressed, that the blessings of which he was the Mediator, might be possessed by fellow-disciples: — but not one in which any supplication is made to Jesus when not actually present; in other words, there is no instance in which prayer was offered to Jesus. No Jew would do this without an express command;—the command (as well as example) of our Lord is directly contrary to it, (see Matt. vi. 6, 9. John xvi. 23. xvii.;)— and the N. T. history affords no fact to countenance the idea, that the first Christians did not follow their Lord's precepts in this respect. Hence therefore the 1st. rendering, (in the common meaning of it at least) though justified by the phraseology of the Septuagint, is not accordant with the matter of fact, and is therefore inadmissible, if there be any other justifiable rendering which is accordant with the matter of fact.——*If* Luke and Paul had believed Jesus to be the "very and eternal God," and *if* it had been customary for the Christians to call upon Jesus as the object of religious worship, then the common rendering of the phrase with its usual interpretation would probably be correct: but supposing neither of these to be the fact, that in short the faith which alone

* We here and in the other places literally render the Septuagint.

is to be derived from Luke's writings was the faith of the first Christians, then we must take either a different rendering, or a different meaning of the common one.

The third rendering most accords with the style of Luke; and in his writings there can be little hesitation therefore respecting it. If we take the instances in which he uses the phrase, in their connexion, thus making him his own interpreter, we see abundant reason to suppose that he meant by it, those who were called disciples of Christ, (not, who were called Christians, because it does not appear that the disciples were then called so.) Saul, full of persecuting rage 'against the *disciples of the Lord*,' obtained letters from the high priest, to the synagogues at Damascus that (ch. ix. 2.) 'if he found any *of this way*' or religion, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem. Ananias, when Jesus in a vision, directed him to go and inquire for Saul, spoke of Paul's conduct towards the '*saints* in Jerusalem,' and added, (vs. 14.) 'and here he hath authority from the chief priest to bind all *who are called by thy name*.' The first three expressions in italics at once appear to be synonimous; or at least explanatory of each other; and the last seems to require the same import: but if we consider the phrase in question as signifying 'all who pray to thee,' to say the least it has nothing to do with the case. If Saul knew no more of the Christians, than we must infer from the preceding chapters of the Acts, he could not himself designate the Christians as persons who prayed to Christ; nor could it (unless the history is excessively defective) be their common designation at that time, since no mention is made of any one's praying to Christ*. Hence therefore, even if it could be admitted that a disciple used the phrase with this meaning as a designation of Christians, we cannot suppose that the Jews of Damascus used it with this meaning (vs. 21:) *they* must surely be understood to say, 'Is not this he who destroyed those' 'who are called by this name,' or 'who are of this way,' (to use the expression in vs. 1.) In these two instances one would think nothing but excessive attachment to a pre-formed system could oppose this rendering.

In Acts xxii. 16. there is greater room for doubt. The verb is here in the middle form, and therefore requires the 1st or 4th rendering, (the second being excluded by the sense.) Which of the two is to be chosen, must be determined by the circumstances of the case; and different circumstances favour each. The reading of the received text 'the name of the Lord,' naturally leads to the quotation twice made (viz. Acts ii. 21. Rom. x. 13.) from Joel, (ii. 32.) 'whosoever calleth upon the name of the Lord shall be saved:' and though it appears that the true reading is 'his name,' this naturally refers to the remote but principal antecedent, 'the God of our fathers,' (vs. 14.) since vs. 15. is obviously

* The case of Stephen has already been referred to; his invocation was an address to Jesus sensibly manifested to him, and was no more a prayer, than the requests of his disciples were, which were made to him during his ministry on earth.

parenthetical. — On the other hand, considering that Saul was actually a religious man, and that Ananias had (as we have seen) before used a similar expression, to denote those who owned the authority of Christ, it seems somewhat more probable that he used it now with a similar import, viz. 'take upon thyself his name.'

One passage only remains, (for Rom. x. 11—13. assuredly refers to God,) viz. 1 Cor. i. 2. 'to the church of God which is at Corinth, to those that are sanctified through Christ Jesus, called to the saints, and to all that in every place are called by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,' or, 'call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.'—If it could be proved that the apostle considered Jesus as the very and eternal God, the object of religious worship, and also that it was a peculiar characteristic of Christians in general in those days, to pray to Jesus, the latter of these two renderings would be somewhat preferable, because the apostle uses the verb in the few other cases in which he employs it with an active force, and because he quotes the very phrase, 'call upon the name of the Lord,' from Joel in reference to the Supreme Being, (Rom. x. 13.) unless however such were a peculiar characteristic of the Christians (and assuredly it was not,) the connexion would obviously point to the former rendering, which is the rendering of the I. V. which brings into view what was certainly a characteristic of them, that they were called, and called themselves disciples of Christ; and it may be remarked, that for many years before this Epistle was written, they were denominated Christians.

It is not enough observed that Luke's common use of the verb, differs from the common use of it in the Septuagint. There is perhaps scarcely an instance in the latter, corresponding to Acts x. 18. 'Simon who was called Peter.' The use of the verb had obviously varied; and therefore, (except when quoting from the O. T.) the N. T. writers would naturally use it in the sense then most customary in such a connexion. — However the grand point is, that the usual interpretation of the usual rendering, supposes that to be a common characteristic of Christians, of which there is no other proof than that usual rendering: and even this rendering if admitted proves nothing, for the only cases in which we know that the first Christians invoked the name of Christ, was by saying 'In the name of Jesus Christ' when they were working a miracle, (Acts iii. 6. iv. 10, 30, &c.) by baptizing 'in the name of Jesus Christ,' (Acts ii. 38. viii. 16. &c.) and by teaching 'in the name of Jesus,' (Acts iv. 17, 18.)

We shall finish these remarks by observing, that there is a wide difference between proving an opinion, and according with a thing when proved. Admit the hypothesis, that the first Christians called upon Jesus as an object of religious worship, and (though there is much which directly opposes it,) some expressions may be sufficiently well explained according to it: but till this is proved, no expression can really support it, which will fairly admit of a different inter-

pretation, accordant with the force of the language, and the manner of the writer. The original phrase in question, would suit this hypothesis sufficiently well, if it were *otherwise proved;* but *of itself* it proves nothing, because it fairly admits of two renderings, one only of which favours the hypothesis, and this itself fairly admits of a different interpretation which in no way supports the hypothesis in question.

We now leave our readers to decide, whether the Eclectic Reviewer were not influenced by an undue attachment to a pre-formed system when he said, (p. 342.) "We find another striking instance of Socinian prejudice in the rendering of επικαλεσμαι" [the verb in question,] "when *Christ* is, without possibility of evasion, the '*object of invocation.*'—We believe the true rendering of Acts ix. 14, 21*. 1 Cor. i. 2. to be 'who are called by,' not 'who call upon.' But if the latter were on the whole to be preferred, and we derive an explanation of the phrase 'call upon the *name* of Jesus,' from the fact, we should say that it meant, teaching in his name, baptizing in his name, working miracles in his name, &c.; in other words, in all things acting under and owning his authority.—Respecting Acts xxii. 16. we believe it fully justifiable, both by the language and by the connexion, to render it as in the I. V. 'taking upon thyself his name,' that is, owning and submitting to his authority; but at present somewhat incline to the opinion, that the phrase should be rendered 'calling upon his name,' that is upon the name of 'the God of our fathers,' who saith Ananias to Paul 'hath appointed thee to know his will.'

VINDICATION OF THE IMPROVED VERSION, 1 TIM. iii. 16.

For the Monthly Repository.

May, 9, 1809.

I did not immediately, on casting my eye over your last number, observe that Theologus had noticed my remarks on his unfortunate criticism on 1 Tim. iii. 16. It was evidently not his wish to give much prominency to the subject, or to urge it on the notice of your readers. Although he has given evident proof of considerable abatement of his confidence, and seems checked and dispirited, he has not shewn marks of penitence. There is no apology made to the Editors of the N. V. for unfounded reprehension. The new Greek is not revoked, so that I must conclude that ὁς φανερωθεις retains all the fond regard of its parent, and is still a darling and beloved child of his affection. But as he appears to bear his faculties at this time, rather meekly, I will make no further attempt to bereave him of the son of his love.

However it seems necessary to examine his last effort to discredit the text adopted by the editors of

* Here the I. V. unnecessarily varies from the mode of rendering in vs. 14; though the verb is the same. It should have been 'who are called by this name.'

the N. V. as it is equally unfounded with the claims of ὃς φανερωθεὶς, to the character of good Greek, and to a place in the room of the corrected text ὃς ἐφανερώθη. And the observation is very natural on this occasion, how tenacious poor humanity is to retain its errors as well as its best founded opinions. As the first ground was not tenable, Theologus has shifted his station, and occupied another equally defenceless, rather than give up the contest.

The reverse of Theologus's assertion is to a certainty the exact truth. Ὃς never stands for ὅστις or ὅσος. This observation is not made rashly. In some cases, *these* may seem to occupy *its* place, but not without a considerable difference of meaning in reality, to be discovered only by a nice attention to the powers of each. Ὃς simply is *never used indefinitely*, it is always definite although it may be used on occasions when the sense is such as that it is indifferent whether it be expressed definitely or indefinitely. And all that can then be inferred is that the sentence is in a definite form when it might have taken a contrary one without incongruity. In that case the translation may, by courtesy, be indefinite, though it cannot be so in strictness. In other words, ὅστις or ὅσος or ὃς may be used in such sentences indifferently, but they are never equivalent, though the nature of the subject may render them undeserving of preference. As well may we say that the sentence is definite where ὅστις is employed as affirm, that it is definite when ὃς enters into its composition. Of this the very etymology is a sufficient proof. But I will illustrate by an example. "The man who assumes the appellation of *a divine* without a large acquaintance with philology, mistakes his place." This sentence is definite to a certain degree. It is not certainly indefinite. And yet it would have been quite as well to have said, "*Whoever, or any man who, &c.*" In short, ὃς simply is never indefinite properly speaking.

But it is not on such *mixed definite*, or *imperfect definite*, occasions alone that ὃς is employed. It is used "when the subject is *quite definite*," as that is in 1 Tim. iii. 16. And I must beg leave to observe that there is but one other mode in which such quite definite subjects can be expressed, viz. that supplied in my last communication instead of the ὃς φανερωθεὶς of Theologus. You have a choice only of ὁ φανερωθεὶς and ὃς ἐφανερώθη. Your correspondent probably *meant* the first. If so, I have his own acknowledgment that it is *quite definite*. And yet it is not more definite than the last, as they are used promiscuously on the very same occasions, and the definite article with the participle is employed as often as the relative with the verb in expressing definite subjects, or in other words, it is as often used when it is indifferent whether the thing be predicated definitely or indefinitely.

As this matter should be settled once for all, I will subjoin some authorities to prove two propositions into which the whole subject resolves itself. After this the text of the N. V. in Tim. iii. 16. will never probably, be attacked on the same ground. It is not my

purpose to undertake, at least at this time, the defence of its purity on external considerations.

I. The text adopted in the N. V. is *supported* by the following authorities, most of which are directly *in point*.

Rom. viii. 32. referred to by the Editors. Ὃς γε του ἰδιου ουκ εφεισατο, αλλ ὑπερ ἡμων παντων παρεδωκεν αυτον, πως ουχι και συν αυτω τα παντα ἡμιν χαρισεται; this example would be of itself decisive. It is the language of Paul, and Theologus has not made good any objection against it.

Mark xiii. 37. Ἀ δε ὑμιν λεγω πασι λεγω.

Mark xiv. 8. Ὁ ειχεν αυτη εποιησε.

John i. 45 Ὁν εγραψε Μωσης, εν τω νομω, και οι προφηται, ευρηκαμεν.

John iii. 34. Ὁν γαρ απεστειλεν ὁ Θεος, τα ῥηματα του Θεου λαλει.

John iv. 18. Και νυν ὁν εχεις, ουκ εστι σου ανηρ.

Rom. vii. 15. Ὁ γαρ κατεργαζομαι ου γινωσκω.

Rom, viii. 24. Ὁ γαρ βλεπει τις, τι και ελπιζει;

Rom. xv. 21. Αλλα καθως γεγραπται. Ὁις ουκ ανηγγελη περι αυτου οψονται, και οἱ ουκ ακηκοασι συνησουσι. Nothing can be more decisive than this text, from the pen of Paul, the author of that in question, and quoted from the Seventy.

1 Cor. x. 20. Ἀ θυει τα εθνη δαιμονιοις θυει.

1 Cor. xv. 36. Αφρων, συ ὁ σπειρεις ου ζωοποιειται.

2 Cor. xi. 17. Ὁ λαλω, ου λαλω κατα κυριον.

Sentent. in mort. apud Poet. min. p. 513. Ed. 1652. Ὁν γαρ φιλει θεος γ,' αποθνεσκει νεος..

Longin. de subl. p. 94. Pearce, 1773. Ὁδ' εφαντασθη, μικρου δειν θεασασθαι και τους ακουοντας ηναγκασεν.

Dem. Olynth ii. p. 90. Ed. Tert. Mounteney. Η ποτε ἁ δει πραξετε η μη νυν.

II. And this construction is clearly *equivalent* to that supplied by my last communication on this subject, instead of the ὃς φανερωθεις which Theologus took for Greek. The proofs must be few, or your valuable pages will be too much occupied.

Mark ix. 40. has, Ὃς γαρ ουκ εστι καθ' ημων, υπερ ημων εστι, and Luke xi. 23. has, Ὁ μη ων μετ' εμου, κατ' εμου εστι; both relating the very same observation of Christ, and using good and equivalent Greek, in confirmation of my proposition.

In Rom. ii. 21, 22, 23, the two forms of expression occur without interruption of intermediate matter. Ὁ ουν διδασκων ἑτερον, &c. ὁ κηρυσσων, &c. ὁ λεγων, &c. ὁ βδελυσσομενος, &c. and verse 23, ὃς εν νομω καυχασαι—τον θεον ατιμαζεις. In 1 Cor. xi. 27. Ὃς αν εσθιη, and 29 ὁ γαρ εσθιων. In 1 John ii. 5. Ὃς τηρη τον αυτου λογον occurs, and in 1 John iii. 21: the equivalent is used, ὁ τηρων τας εντολας αυτου.

In 1 John iv. 6. We have the two equivalent expressions, ὁ γινωσκων τον θεον ακουει ἡμων: Ὃς ουκ εστιν εκ θεου ουκ ακουει ἡμων. And this last instance is an unimpeachable authority for each of the two propositions which I have been endeavouring to establish.

It was my intention to make a few observations of a general nature that occurred to me while I was collecting the above texts.

One of them upon the definite nature of ὅς, when used simply, definite even when employed to express a meaning otherwise indefinite, might save some future trouble and embarrassment. But I am neither disposed nor at leisure to supply means of safety to one who has volunteered as the reprover of men, who could certainly in this case, hurl back the censure which recoiled from themselves and left them harmless.

PRIMITIVUS.

THE TRUE MEANING OF THE LAST CLAUSE OF JOHN vi. 27.

May 10, 1809.

"——To him, hath God the Father," or the Father, even God, "set his seal."

"This last clause (says Mr. Kenrick, in loc: refers to the miracles of Christ, which gave him the authority of God for teaching in the same manner as a prince setting his seal to a writing, gives to that writing authority to convey his sentiments."

Mr. Jones however, (*Illustr.* &c. in loc.) is dissatisfied with this interpretation, and observes that an allusion is here designed to the custom of the victims proper for sacrifice being marked, or *sealed*, by an officer appointed for the purpose, which practice, on the authority I think of *Plutarch*, in his treatise *de Is. et Osir.* he states to have existed among the Gentiles.

Now I beg leave to submit to the reconsideration of the learned and ingenious author of the *Illustrations*, &c. whether on his own principle, it be at all probable that our Lord, with the associations and education of a Jew, should refer to a custom which, for aught that appears had no existence in his own country, and with which therefore he could scarcely be acquainted?

Until this question be satisfactorily answered, Mr. Kenrick's exposition of the passage must be admitted as perfectly correct.

N.

REVIEW.

"STILL PLEAS'D TO PRAISE, YET NOT AFRAID TO BLAME."

POPE.

ART. I. *The New Testament, in an Improved Version, upon the Basis of Archbishop Newcome's New Translation: with a corrected Text, and Notes Critical and Explanatory.* Royal 8vo. pp. 640. Two Maps. 16s. 1808. J. Johnson and Longman and Co. London.

[*Continued from p.* 221.]

The next of the principal controverted passages in which the I. V. departs from Newcome is, 1 Cor. i. 2. 'to all that in every place are called by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,' instead of 'call upon the name,' in which Newcome agrees with the common rendering. We have already stated, in a general manner our opinion respecting this mode of rendering; but it is a point of so much moment, and on which so much stress is laid by some, that we proposed to consider it here more minutely. Our examination of it has, however, extended so much beyond our expectations, that we must refer our readers for it to the head of Biblical Criticism *. We have endeavoured in it to keep in view that class of thinking readers of the N. T. who do not possess much of any acquaintance with the original.

1 Cor. xv. 47. we have already noticed, (p. 158. col. 2.)

2 Cor. viii. 9. 'that while he was rich for your sakes he lived in poverty,' presents an important and fully justified departure from Newcome. Perhaps however it would have been better to have adhered rather more literally to the original, 'that for you he was poor, though he was rich.'—It is one of the many instances in which the original admits of different renderings, and the choice must be determined by the circumstances of the case. Of itself it can prove nothing.—Schleusner considers the verb επτωχευσε as referring, not so much to poverty in the literal sense, as to the distresses and sufferings which Christ underwent for the good of men. In ch. vi. 10. is a beautiful illustration of this passage, 'as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; as chastened, and not killed; as grieving, yet always rejoicing; *as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.*'

Eph. iii. 19. 'and to know the surpassing love of the knowledge of Christ,' rests solely for its justification upon the transposition of της γνωσεως, which is greatly deficient in evidence. We prefer therefore a literal rendering according to the R. T. 'and to know what indeed surpasseth knowledge, the love of Christ,' i. e. the love manifested in the Christian dispensation.

* p. 266.

Philip. ii. 6, 7. 'who being in the form of God, did not eagerly grasp at the resemblance to God, but divested himself *of it*.' Though we have over and over again examined this passage, and have at times felt some degree of decision respecting the various renderings of it, we are unable to pronounce decisively as to them. The Editors of the I. V. seem to feel somewhat of the same indecision, for they say in the note, "Or, if it should be translated with the public version, 'he thought it not robbery to be as God,' the sense would be, &c." Though in some points of view the construction of the original, best suits the mode of rendering adopted in the I. V. yet the sense appears to us most complete in the latter. The translation in that case would run, 'who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be as God, yet divested himself *of that form*,' &c. In what sense it is true that Jesus thought it not robbery to be as God, we may derive from John v. 17, 19, 26. &c. viz. speaking with the authority of God, and acting agreeably to the purposes of God directly communicated to him.—If however the first mode of rendering be preferable, we could wish for a closer approach to the phraseology of the original; but we own ourselves unable to propose any closer rendering which would preserve the spirit of that in the I. V.

Col. i. 19. 'For it hath pleased *the Father* to inhabit all fulness by him.' The original is, Ὁτι εν αυτω ευδοκησε παν το πληρωμα κατοικησαι. In ch. ii. 9. the original is, Ὁτι εν αυτω κατοικει παν το πληρωμα της θεοτητος σωματικως, and the rendering of the I. V. is, 'For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the deity bodily.' We are at a loss to see upon what principle of translation the Editors departed from Newcome's rendering of the first passage, 'that in him all fulness should dwell.' However thus much is obvious, that it was not through theological prepossession; for that would have directed to retain the common rendering, since it points out the original source of that fulness of divine blessings which dwelt in Christ, and with which the apostle says, ch. ii. 10. the Colossian disciples were filled.

1 Tim. iii. 16. The rendering of the I. V. here varies from N. principally on account of the change in the text adopted by Griesbach, who reads ὁς instead of θεος the common reading. There can, we imagine, be no doubt in the minds of any who have habituated themselves to the principles of criticism now prevalent among the learned, that θεος is not the true reading. The MSS. evidence appears most satisfactory for ὁς; and Griesbach decidedly prefers it. To us ὁ appears to have greater claims than he allows, and even to deserve the preference; but here as every where else we would follow Griesbach as a standard in the text, and rest satisfied with giving any apparently preferable reading in the margin.—If Griesbach's reading be adopted, does ὁς refer to an antecedent, or as in several other places, may it be rendered 'He who.' Against the latter is urged the supposed deficiency of instances precisely similar; against the former,

which would refer it to 'the living God,' in vs. 15, may be urged the great harshness of the construction which requires the intervening words to be completely parenthetical, and the great inapplicability of the subsequent clauses to 'the living God,' unless indeed it can be shewn that 'Christ Jesus, (vs. 13.) and 'the living God' are the same being, which is expressly contrary to Paul's own words in 1 Cor. viii. 6. As to the objections against 'He who,' they appear likely to be fully discussed in the Repository; and we have no room for a satisfactory examination of them here: we shall therefore only add, that if Griesbach's reading be adopted, we believe the rendering of this passage in the I. V. to be the true one.

The alterations in the Epistle to the Hebrews, appear to be more numerous in proportion than in any other book; and they are in general decided improvements. In ch. i. in particular they are very important, and with one exception are fully justifiable. The rendering in vs. 8 is not accordant with the Greek idiom, nor required by the connexion. 'But to the Son *he saith*, God is thy throne for ever and ever, &c.' The passage is a quotation from Ps. xlv. 6, 7. which is most obviously addressed to Solomon, and of which the writer to the Hebrews applies a part (the whole he could not apply) to Christ. Agreeably to the latitude of the Hebrew language, the Psalmist addresses Solomon as Elohim, a god: 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever———therefore God even thy God,' &c. There could surely be no reason why the writer to the Hebrews, a Jew, familiar with the Hebrew idiom, should hesitate in applying to Christ an appellation which the Psalmist applies to Solomon, when actually applying to him the very words of the Psalmist.—The latter clause of vs. 2. is rendered by Mr. Simpson, Ess. viii. 'by whom also he constituted the age.' If this rendering be justifiable, (and Mr. S. urges strong reasons in favour of it,) it is preferable to that of the I V. since it employs the preposition in its usual sense with the genitive. However there is sufficient authority for the rendering of the I V.

The first three verses of John's first Epistle are rendered we think on satisfactory grounds, agreeably to the version of that eminent disciple of Jesus, the late venerable Theophilus Lindsey; and the Editors embrace the opportunity of speaking of his excellence as a Christian, and of the importance of his theological labours. We too cannot pass the passage, without expressing our respectful and affectionate veneration of the character of one, whose life was spent in the service of God; whose many years all added to the hoary head some rays in its crown of glory, obscured by no dark spots of vice, and scarcely dimmed by those imperfections with which human worth is ever attended; who was illustrious for the discharge of Christian duty, not only in the common walks of life, but in some which led to peculiar exertions and peculiar sacrifices; who laboured with such zeal and success, to remove some of the greatest corruptions of Christianity; and who, supported by its hopes and prospects, long stood on the brink of the

grave undismayed, with serenity and chearful satisfaction almost superior to suffering and to death itself, regarding it as but a passage to that world where sin and sorrow and suffering will be no more. What an example has this aged disciple left, and what encouragement does it yield to steady, persevering, faithful exertions in the cause of Christian truth and duty.

These are the principal instances in which the rendering affects the doctrines supposed to be derived from the N. T. respecting the person of our Saviour.—In the most important we think the Editors have been very successful; in others we differ from them in the minutiæ; and in others again, we think that they are not fully borne out by the usages of the original language. We are conscious that in these remarks we have had no object but truth in view; and we trust that, if they appear satisfactory to the reader, they will not be thought to derogate from the general indisputable and unrivalled fidelity and value of the version.

In two somewhat material points we consider the Editors as having erred in their principles as to the correction of their basis;—in the rendering of nouns which are without the article, and in the diversity in their modes of translating the same phraseology in the original.—The first involves some of the greatest difficulties in the Greek language, as far as respects the transfusion of the ideas of the writer into our own language. The Greek article denotes that the noun to which it belongs is used definitely; but we must determine from the connexion whether the noun is restricted to an individual in distinction from other individuals, or is applied to an individual as one of a particular class, in distinction from individuals of other classes: as when we say in English *the dog*, the connexion alone can determine whether we mean *a particular dog*, or only *any animal of the dog-tribe*. This ambiguity in the force of the article, (or rather of the noun to which it is prefixed, for the article in all cases defines,) sometimes causes considerable perplexity as to the proper rendering: thus in John i. 21. the Jews ask the Baptist whether he were ὁ προφητης, which leaves it somewhat uncertain what they meant, whether *a prophet*, i. e. one of those who had formerly sustained a prophetic character, or, *the prophet*, i, e. that prophet which was expected by the Jews in consequence of the predictions of Moses. N. renders it *a prophet*, the I. V. *the prophet*, and we think with strict propriety.

Again, the absence of the article does not necessarily make the noun indefinite; and indeed in a great variety of cases the Greek language does not require, and sometimes scarcely admits of the article, where the noun is completely definite*. On this account it is often truly difficult to

* A great deal of valuable information respecting the actual usages of the Greek article, mixed with abundance of error as to the theory of it, and several unjust conclusions respecting the employment of it in the N. T. founded upon an obscure and erroneous hypothesis, will be found in Middleton's Doctrine of the Greek article. Every admirer of Middleton should carefully examine the state-

decide whether a noun without the article would be best represented in English by the noun preceded by *the*, or by the noun preceded by *an*, or (sometimes) by the noun only; since the connexion and circumstances of the case alone can determine the point, and these often lead to very different results according to the different points of view in which they are observed. For instance, Θεος may be translated God, the God, or a god, according to the circumstances and connexion; and υἱος son, the son, or a son: and from this ambiguity υἱος Θεου admits of various renderings, for instance a son of God, the son of God, a son of a god, the son of a god, &c. Accordingly in the declaration of the centurion, Matt. xxvii. 54. the Editors of the I. V. have rendered Θεου υἱος *a* son of a god, though in vs. 43. they have left the archbishop's rendering of the same phrase, viz. the son of God. In Mark xv. 39. the same phrase in the same declaration is rendered *the* son of a god. If the second noun be to be rendered indefinitely, the first noun should be rendered definitely, as in the latter instance from Mark; but we feel much more satisfied with Newcome's rendering, the son of God, since we view the centurion not merely as a Roman, but as a resident in Judea, and not improbably a devout man, and one who was looking for the Messiah. In other instances too, this phrase is rendered indefinitely where to us it appears that the weight, though nearly equal on each side, preponderates in favour of the definite rendering adopted by Newcome: we have remarked the following Matt. xiv. 33. John xix. 7. and Luke iv. 9. In the last instance the true reading of the original is the same as in Matt. iv. 6. υἱος του Θεου, and really requires the rendering which is employed in the latter place, in precisely the same circumstances.

We more decidedly object to the rendering of ἡμερα κρισεως a day of judgment, in Matt. x. 15. xi. 24. xii. 36, &c. The sense appears absolutely to require the definite article in English; and the original does not oppose the use of it. In one passage at least (2 Pet. ii. 9.) the I. V. retains Newcome's definite rendering of the very same phrase, 'the day of judgment;' which we mention merely to shew that the Editors did not consider the alteration as required by the original, and we know not how they could consider it as required by the sense.

In several other less important instances, we differ from the Editors as to their departures from Newcome in the translation of the Greek noun not having an article, (e. g. John vi. 59. 1 Tim. iv. 10.) and in others should have wished to have seen a departure from Newcome where he renders an articled noun indefinitely, (e.g. Matt. v. 1. ix. 1, 28, &c. and similar passages in the other evangelists:) but in several we agree with them, and one of these will serve to illustrate some of our

ments of Calvin Winstanley in his very judicious vindication of certain passages in the Common English Version of the N. T. (Longman and Co.) which though published some years before Middleton's work, is completely unnoticed (refuted it could not be) by that learned but prejudiced writer.

preceding remarks. The altar erected by the Athenians (Acts xvii. 23.) was inscribed *αγνωστω θεω*, which by Newcome is rendered, 'to the unknown God.' This rendering is justifiable, in so far as it naturally means 'to that unknown God' who removed our pestilence, and Paul's reasoning implies that it was to some particular divinity, though they knew not whom, that the Athenians ascribed their deliverance; but it is exceptionable, because it leads the mind of the English reader to the inference that it was to the true God. Hence the rendering of the I. V. 'to an unknown God' (who removed our pestilence) we regard as preferable.

The second point in which we think the I. V. defective, is the variation observable in the mode of rendering the same words or phrases. It should be an uniform principle in translating the N. T. that the same expressions in the original should, wherever the same idea is conveyed, be represented by the same expressions in the translation, if the English idiom will permit it. And if from any circumstance, the customary rendering of an expression be left, it should be inserted in the margin. We have already noticed in our remarks on the article, one instance, where the same combination of words is rendered with some variation, even in the very same circumstances; and we are apprehensive that the editors may not have considered uniformity of rendering, as of the importance which it assuredly is. Some other instances must be produced in support of this observation. In Hebr. i. 5. v. 5. we find N. left for 'this day I have adopted thee:' in Acts xiii. 33. the common rendering of precisely the same expression, is retained, 'this day I have begotten thee.'—The very peculiar Hebraism, on which this and similar expressions are founded, even if it could have been uniformly reduced to an *equivalent* English idiom, (which we very much doubt,) should have always been literally represented in the margin: and at any rate, it would have been better to have in all cases retained the Hebraism, unless it had been uniformly departed from. Upon this principle, we consider the following passages as exceptionable: 1 Cor. iv. 15. 'for I am your father in Christ Jesus, by preaching to you the gospel,' *εγω υμας εγεννησα*; to which no objection could exist, if the mode of rendering could have been always preserved, but in Philem. 10. we have 'for my son, whom I have begotten in my bonds,' *ον εγεννησα*. In 1 John v. 1. the meaning of the original is lost sight of, by an unnecessary variation of the same verb; 'and whosoever loveth the Father, loveth the Son also,' which last clause necessarily refers the reader to Jesus Christ, but what is meant is, *every* child of God, and this meaning would have been preserved, and the awkwardness of the preceding clause in the common version avoided, if the verse had been rendered, 'whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God, *γεγεννηται*; and whosoever loveth the Father, *τον γεννησαντα*, loveth him also that is born of him, *τον γεγεννημενον εξ αυτου*.' That *μονογενης*, which is usually rendered by its just

equivalent *only*, is in 1 John iv. 9. rendered *only-begotten*, we consider as a merely accidental circumstance.—The following are some other instances of the want of uniformity in rendering which we have noticed. In Mark xiii. 14. N. has been left for the common rendering 'the abomination of desolation,' but in Matt xxiv. 15. though the original has the same words, Newcome's translation is retained, viz. 'the abominating desolation.' In Matt. iii. 7. we find 'offspring of vipers,' instead of Newcome's 'generation of vipers;' the change is a good one, but we do not see why the same change should not have been made in ch. xii. 34. where the I. V. has 'brood of vipers.' In 1 Tim. i. 11. the I. V. has 'the blessed God,' where N. has 'the happy God;' (so also in ch. vi. 15.) The alteration is a very good one; and we should have been glad to have seen it more frequent, indeed in all cases where the happiness spoken of is of a religious nature, or the result of religious conduct. *Blessed* seems to us, always to convey the idea of happiness *as resulting from* the ordinations of providence; and in some instances the word *happy* appears improper, as perhaps necessarily implying a present state of mind, which *blessed* does not: a person may be *blessed* when he is in deep distress, but he is not *happy*; and afflictions may be *blessings*, but they are not themselves *happiness*. This rather refers however, to what has been left in the I. V. than to what has been altered; but as Newcome has retained *blessed* in Luke x. 23. and xxiii. 29, we should have wished to have seen *blessed* in the passage corresponding to the former (Mat. xiii. 16.) or *happy* in all. We observe about six passages in which μακαριος ought we think to be rendered *happy* (viz. Matt. xxiv. 46. Luke xii. 37, 38, 43. Acts xxvi. 2. 1 Cor. vii. 40.;) and some others in which it is nearly indifferent which rendering is preferred; but in by far the greater number *blessed* appears to us decidedly preferable, particularly in Matt. v. 3—11. Luke vi. 20, 22. Acts xx. 35. Tit. ii. 13. James i. 12, 25. 1 Pet. iii. 14. iv. 13. Rev. xiv. 13. and those places in which the I. V. has *blessed*. Before we made these remarks, we attentively considered Newcome's note on Matt. v. 3. but we are satisfied that the primate was in an error, and a reference to Johnson's examples would perhaps have led him to think so too.

We had marked some other passages the rendering of which in the I. V. does not seem to us to be an improvement (or at least the right improvement) on Newcome; but we bear in mind that our own renderings may appear to others as exceptionable, as the instances which we refer to, do to us. We aspire not to infallibility, and we have no room to justify every minute remark which we might otherwise make. —It would be exceedingly easy to point out numerous improvements; but we must be satisfied with the general approbation which we have more than once expressed; and we feel a firm conviction, that if any unbiassed critic will examine the alterations with the same minuteness with ourselves, he will arrive at the same conclusion, that the I. V. is a decided and material improvement upon the basis which has been employed.

The *punctuation* of such a work is a very material circumstance; and we have seen no reason for dissatisfaction on this point. The typographical execution of the work does great credit to the printer and to the editors; but we take for granted that the merit of the peculiarities in punctuation rests with the latter. Several important instances occur, in which the sense is affected by the punctuation, and in which that of Newcome is very judiciously left; e. g. Matt. xxv. 26. xxvii. 42. Mark i. 34. John iv. 37. 38. vii. 28. xii. 27*. In a small number of cases we feel doubtful respecting the punctuation of the I. V. viz. Mark ix. 23. Luke xii. 49. Acts xxvi. 28. which are all that we have noticed.—Respecting the paragraphs we are less satisfied. In the gospels the divisions are founded on Newcome's Harmony; and in addition to the initial capitals they very often break the apparent continuity of the history; see for instance Matt. viii. 1, 2.

The *orthography* is a very minor consideration; but we just notice it to express our regret that Newcome's *murther* and *murtherer* had been uniformly changed.

Several minute but not unimportant alterations, have been made with reference to the *grammatical* usages of our language; e. g. Matt. xvi. 13, 15. xxvii. 53. Acts xiii. 2, 25, 26. In three instances at least, the legitimate relative *who* is employed instead of Newcome's *that*, (viz. Matt. vi. 9, 18. compare vs. 6. where *that* in precisely the same circumstances is left;) and we regret that this has not been done much more frequently. We wish that the present English idiom had been more attended to, in another class of renderings, viz. those of the relative; e. g Acts xxi. 37. where *who* should surely be, *and he*, or *and the commander*. In Matt vi. 6, 7. the Primate's *will* and *shall* should have changed places.—But our readers must be as much wearied with these minutiæ as ourselves; and we shall desist. In our next number, we shall make some remarks respecting the notes; and will endeavour to subjoin the collation which we formerly mentioned of the I. V. with Griesbach; and this will finish our laborious and we apprehend tedious article.

ART. II. *Lectures on Systematic Theology and Pulpit Eloquence. By the late George Campbell, D. D. F. R. S. Ed. Principal of Marischal College.* Aberdeen. 8vo. pp. 542.

The former publications of this very respectable writer, viz. "The Philosophy of Rhetoric," "A Dissertation on Miracles," in reply to Mr. Hume, "A New Translation of the Four Gospels," with preliminary critical Dissertations, and "Lectures on Ecclesiastical History," have given such an eclat to his name, as to supersede our eulogiums; and have secured him such a reputa-

* Respecting this instance some critics seem to have forgotten, that the prayer here offered was not during our Lord's agony in the garden. This punctuation appears to us perfectly correct.

tion for being a judicious, learned and liberal character, as to raise him above our praise; any further than as the posthumous work now before us may have a claim, by its peculiar merits, to appropriate commendations.

It is with pleasure, we notice from the Advertisement prefixed to it, that "the favourable reception of the Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, and the desire of many to have an opportunity of perusing Dr. Campbell's prelections on the other branches of his theological course, have prompted the editor to offer to the public this work. These prelections were composed for the benefit of the students of divinity in Marischal College, without any view to publication. They were first delivered in the years 1772 and 1773, and the author continued during his professorship, to read them to the students, as they had been at first composed. Indeed, they were written," we are told, "so closely as to admit very little addition or alteration.

"But though they want the benefit of the author's corrections," we have no scruple in subscribing to the editor's character of them, as just and merited. "The language it is presumed," he says, "will not be found very deficient in that perspicuity, precision and accuracy, which distinguished Dr. Campbell as a writer. His other acknowledged qualities as an author, the judicious and attentive reader will not be at a loss to discern. He will discover in this volume, great ingenuity with no affectation of singularity, freedom and impartiality of spirit, without any propensity to fabricate new theories, acuteness of understanding without precipitancy or impatience in judging; endowments perhaps rare, but of the first importance in theological discussions. To students of theology, these discourses will be highly useful. They are more of a practical nature than his lectures formerly published, and they abound in valuable counsels and remarks. From this volume and from the author's work on the Gospels, the student will learn, both by precept and example, how his industry and ingenuity may be most profitably employed."

The discourses in this instructive and valuable course of lectures, are twenty-two: under three distinct arrangements of Introductory Discourses, of Systematic Theology and on Pulpit Eloquence.

The first Lecture in the Series of Introductory Discourses, treats of the science of theology, and its several branches: here the author recommends *biblical criticism* as the first branch of the theoretical part of the study of theology, and as particularly calculated for the elucidation of our religion, by leading us to the true meaning of the sacred "volume, its acknowledged source." To this he adds *sacred history*, and *theological controversy* as the great branches of that science, which are sufficient to complete the character of the theologian, as the word is commonly understood. The second Lecture turns on the practical part of the theological profession, or the duties of the pastoral office; and shews how the acquisitions made in theology as a science, are to be employed for the benefit of the Christian people: here pulpit elo-

quence, propriety of conduct in private life, and also propriety in the public character or the judicial capacity, which a minister in the country and church of Scotland, is called to act in, are considered. The third Lecture offers remarks on the manner in which the branches of theology above mentioned ought to be treated: that is, from the chair of the professor, on whom a regular attendance for four winters is the utmost to be expected from the same set of students; and at a seminary, where part are coming and part going, not every year but every month and every week and every day. In this lecture the doctor lays down the method, which he proposed to adopt. The fourth Lecture treats of the conduct which students of divinity ought to pursue.

Our author observes here, as it were in passing, that "historical knowledge is of immense use in criticism, from the acquaintance to which it introduces us with ancient manners, laws, rites and idioms."

The leading subject of the next series of Lectures in this volume, is systematic theology. The first lecture is "Of the study of Natural Religion, and of the Evidences of Christianity." In this place, Dr. Campbell suggests, "that the use of reading elaborate demonstrations of the being and attributes of God is more perhaps to fix our attention on the object, than to give conviction to the understanding. The natural evidences of true theism are among the simplest and at the same time the clearest deductions from the effect to the cause. And it were to be wished, that the subject had not been rather perplexed than facilitated, by the abstruse and metaphysical discussions, in which it hath been sometimes involved."—The method which our author strongly urges on the student, to attain to a just and comprehensive acquaintance with the nature, evidence and doctrines of Christianity is not to "read commentators, systematists, paraphrasts, controvertists, demonstrations, confutations, apologies, answers, defences, replies and the like," in the first instance; but, "devoutly to study the scriptures themselves," with the aids to be derived from history, jewish, canonical and ecclesiastic; from the study of the sacred languages with their idioms, from an acquaintance with the Septuagint, from a knowledge of jewish and ancient customs, polity, laws and manners, and from the philosophy of the human mind. This method he recommends as what, in his own experience he had found to answer best. He afterwards applied himself to the perusal of controversial writers and of the attacks made on our religion; and when on a little reflection, he found himself able to refute the antagonists' arguments, he never inquired about any answers that might have been published. He carried this so far once as to set about the publication of his answer to Mr. Hume's subtle attack on the Christian religion, before he had an opportunity of perusing the work of any former answerer. But with ingenuous candor, he does not recommend this conduct to imitation. It would gratify us to give large extracts from this Lecture, but our limits do not permit it; and we must

proceed to the following lectures.

The second is "of the Christian System;" shewing that "the scriptures ought to be the first study," with a concession that "afterwards systems and commentaries may be occasionally consulted," and exhibiting the "bad consequences of beginning the study of theology with systems and commentaries." The third inquires "how a student ought to set about the examination of the scriptures;" and offers directions for forming an abstract of the doctrine of holy writ. The fourth furnishes directions for forming a system of Christian morality;" and points out the advantages of the method recommended." In the fifth, "the subject is continued." And the author shews that "the knowledge of the scriptures is the most essential part of the study;" while he inquires, "How far the study of controversy demands our attention." The sixth and last Lecture lays down the "method of our prosecuting our inquiries in polemic divinity. The use to be made of scholia, paraphrases and commentaries:" and the "danger of relying on human guidance in matters of religion." Paraphrase is a species of exposition which, particularly incurs the censure of our author. "There is in the Paraphrast," he observes, "an appearance of presumption, both in giving what he seems to imagine a more proper style to the inspired writer, and in his manner of interweaving his own sentiments indiscriminately with those delivered by unerring wisdom, with which neither the commentator, nor the scholiast is chargeable; for in these the text and commentary are never confounded by being blended." He considers verbosity as the proper character of this kind of composition: "but by a multiplicity of words the sentiment is not set off and accommodated, but like David equipt in Saul's "armour, it is encumbered and opprest. Yet," as he adds, "this is not the only, nor perhaps the worst consequence resulting from this manner of treating sacred writ. In the very best compositions of this kind, that can be expected, the gospel may be compared to a rich wine of high flavour, diluted in such a quantity of water, as renders it extremely vapid. This would be the case, if the paraphrase (which is indeed hardly possible,) took no tincture from the opinions of the paraphrast, but exhibited faithfully, though insipidly, the sentiment of the text. Whereas in all those paraphrases we have seen, the gospel may more justly be compared to such a wine as hath been mentioned, so much adulterated with a liquor of a very different taste and quality, that little or nothing of its original relish and properties can be discovered. Accordingly in one paraphrase, Jesus Christ appears in the character of a bigoted Papist, in another of a flaming Protestant; in one he argues with all the sophistry of the Jesuit, in another he declaims with all the fanaticism of the Jansenist; in one you trace the metaphysical ratiocinations of Arminius, in another you recognize the bold conclusions of Gomarus; and you hear the language of a man who has thoroughly imbibed the system of one or other of our Christian

Rabbies. So various and so opposite are the characters, which in those performances our Lord is made to sustain, and the dialects which he is made to speak."

"As it is not enough for the Christian minister, that he be instructed in the science of theology, unless he has the skill to apply his knowledge, to answer the different purposes of the pastoral charge," the Lectures of the next and third Series turn on pulpit eloquence, under the following heads. I. Importance of the Study and objections against it answered.—Helps for the attainment of the art. II. Of the sentiment in Pulpit Discourses. III. Of the Expression. IV. Of Pronunciation. V. Discourses distributed into various kinds, as addressed to the understanding, the imagination, the passions and the will. VI. Of the composition of Lectures. N. B. A mode of Exposition, generally prevalent in the church of Scotland. VII. Of Explanatory Sermons. The choice of Subjects and of Texts. VIII. Of Explanatory Sermons--The Introduction--Exposition of the Text—Partition of the Subject. Unity a principal requisite in the Subject—how this is to be observed. Offences against Unity. IX. Of Explanatory Sermons. — How the branches should be arranged and treated.—Of the Style.—Technical language to be avoided and that of the Scripture preferred.—Abuse of Scripture Style.—Of the Conclusion. X. Of Controversial Discourses.—Candour and Simplicity ever to be studied in the defence of truth. XI. Of Commendatory Discourses, or those addressed to the imagination. XII. Of Pathetic Discourses, or those addressed to the Passions. Of Persuasive Discourses, or such as are intended to operate on the Will.

From this analytical survey of the subjects discussed in these Lectures, the student and young divine will obviously see the connection, which they have with his pursuits; and the importance of them, in the hands of an enlightened and judicious mind, such as was eminently that of Dr. Campbell, cannot but affect him. It is indeed, a distinguishing excellence, that pervades these Lectures, that the reader is called on to think for himself, not to bow to the authority of a great name: he is invited and encouraged to make his own researches and not to trust to the investigations made for him by others. They can scarcely be perused with care and attention, without inspiring the mind with the spirit of intellectual freedom and vigour, with which the author writes; and which is not to be much expected from, nor is generally found in, a minister of any religious establishment: especially, where the proceedings of its synods and general assemblies have, even in these times, shewn in several instances, a disposition to enforce with vigour, the dogmas and principles of the Kirk; without much regard to that "liberty, wherewith Christ has made us free."

We cannot conclude this article without giving some further specimens of our author's manner, of the judgment and precision with which he writes.

His remarks on "Perspicuity" merit the attention of the young divine.

"Perspicuity," says Dr. Campbell, "is in a great measure a relative quality. A speech may be perspicuous to one, which to another is unintelligible. It is possible indeed, to be obscure in pleading before the most learned and discerning judges, because the pleader's style may be remarkably perplexed and intricate, but without any perplexity or intricacy of style, it is even more than possible, that a man of reading and education shall speak obscurely, when he addresses himself in a set discourse to simple and illiterate people. There is a cause of darkness in this case, totally independent of the grammatical structure of the sentences, and the general character of the style. It is besides, of all causes of obscurity, that which is most apt to escape the notice of a speaker. Nothing is more natural than for a man to imagine, that what is intelligible to him, is so to every body, or at least that he speaks with sufficient clearness, when he uses the same language, and in equal plainness with that in which he hath studied the subject and been accustomed to read. But however safe this rule of judging may be in the barrister and the senator, who generally address their discourses to men of similar education with themselves, and of equal or nearly equal abilities and learning, it is by no means a proper rule for the preacher, one destined to be in spiritual matters, a guide to the blind, a light to them who are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish and a teacher of babes. Therefore, besides the ordinary rules of perspicuity in respect of diction, which in common with every other public speaker he ought to attend to, he must advert to this in particular, that the terms and phrases he employs in his discourse be not beyond the reach of the inferior ranks of people. Otherwise his preaching is to the bulk of his audience but beating the air; whatever the discourse may be in itself, the speaker is to them, no better than a sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." p. 303, 304.

Another paragraph shall be taken from the Lecture, in which our author states the advantages, which will arise from that study of the scriptures, independently of systems and commentators, which he recommends.

"One advantage well deserving the student's serious attention is this. It puts him," urges Dr C. "upon a method, by means of which, he can hardly be in a situation wherein he may not have it in his power to employ his time profitably in the acquisition of useful knowledge, and in forming habits of composition. I can easily conceive and I believe many of you gentlemen, may have experienced what I am going to mention, I say I can easily conceive that the situation in which you may sometimes find yourselves, may be such as affords very little advantage for study or any plan of reading that could well be proposed. The books which I might recommend may not be found in the places to which your circumstances may lead you, and even the most ordinary helps may not be at hand. On the plan I propose, a great deal may be done with no other book but the Bible and a Concordance, which are to be found every where. Such of you as can read Hebrew, and it is what you all ought to read, should never be without a Hebrew bible of your own, and let me add to this a copy of the Septuagint and the Greek New Testament. And if ye have these, which are neither cumbersome nor expensive, ye are so richly provided, that it is your own fault, if ye are not improving daily. The other books, which I have recommended for your advancement in the knowledge of sacred history, and for familiarizing you to the Jewish manners, ceremonies, idioms, he ought to use when ye have the opportunity of such assistances; but ought always to remember, that the want of them needs never impede your progress, and consequently is no excuse for your being idle. It is a point of the utmost consequence to young men, that we lay down to them a proper method of employing their time, not in a certain imaginary situation which one might devise or wish, but in those actual situations, in which the greater part of you have the probability of being. I have known directions given to students, which seemed to proceed on the hypothesis, that they were to live all their days in the midst of a library, where no literary production of any name was wanting. The consequence of this was, that the impractibility of the execution made all the sage directions they received, to be almost as soon

forgotten as given; and even if they were not forgotten, as they could not be put in practice, for want of the necessary implements recommended, they would serve only as an excuse for idleness. I would as much as possible supply this defect; and allow me to add, I would deprive every one of you if I can, of that silly pretext for doing nothing, that you have not books. I insist upon it, that the young student while he has the Bible, may still be usefully employed." p. 184, 185, 186, 187.

The books, to which in the preceding passage there is a reference, as recommended to the student in theology, are, besides the History and Antiquities of Josephus, Vitringa de Synagoga vetere, Reland de rebus Sacris Judæorum, Lewis's Antiquities of the Hebrew Republic, Godwin's Moses and Aaron, Cunæus de republica Hebræorum, Bertram de republica Judaica, Buxtorf's Lexicon talmudicum and his Synagoga Judaica: and, as greater proficiency is made, Selden and Spencer. Our author subjoins, to the enumeration of these books;

"If you should not happen to meet with any of these for some time, I am far from thinking that great progress may not be made by your own application only, with the assistance of the original languages, and the translation of the Septuagint. I would never have any young man, who has a tolerable capacity, and is willing to use it, to be discouraged for want of books." p. 154, 155.

We will only add, that these "Lectures" of Dr. Campbell highly merit to be added to the list of Tracts on the ministerial character, which Dr. Toulmin has prefixed to his recent edition of the judicious, comprehensive and valuable Treatise of Mr. MASON, entitled "The Student and Pastor." T.

ART. III. *Cruelty to Dumb Creatures, a sinful Abuse of that Power originally delegated to Man, and inconsistent with the Christian character: a Sermon preached in the Churches of St. John and St. Mary Devizes. On Sunday, August the 16th, 1807, at the request of the Rev. Henry Brindley, of Lacock, Wilts. By the Curate of Devizes.* 8vo. pp. 23. 1s.

On taking up a Sermon with this title, we little expected to find, at the very opening of it, what John Calvin styles "a barbarous, insipid, and profane word*," the word TRINITY, staring us in the face in large capitals. But so it is. For the preacher, speaking of the creation of man, observes, that "here God puts, as it were, his own hand to the work; and the blessed TRINITY is represented to us as determining the creation of man, as an extraordinary work.—Let us make man in OUR image, after OUR likeness."—It follows, however, in the next verse, "So God created man in HIS OWN image:"—But this, we suppose, it did not suit the preacher's purpose to introduce.

The preacher grounds his plea for humanity to dumb creatures on these two considerations; "first, that they are all the work of God's hands, and secondly, that the grant of dominion over them, which was given to man, constituted him only lord of the

* 'Martin Luther says, it were better to call Almighty God, *God*, than *Trinity*. And John Calvin says, the word *Trinity* is barbarous, insipid, profane.'——Ben Mordecai's First Letter, p. 75, 4to. Edit.

creatures,—not a despotic tyrant;" and his reasoning on this ground seems, in general, to be incontrovertible; but when he hazards such remarks as the following, he must not be surprised if they find a less ready acquiescence: "whenever they [the creatures] prove dangerous and hurtful to us, we should blame ourselves, and not them. We should remember that when man in Paradise ceased to be obedient to his Maker, his apostacy was justly followed by the rebellion of those creatures, over which, when innocent, he had an unresisted command. Therefore when they are stubborn and refractory, we should not forget that the fall of man was the cause: and if we have any sense of our own condition *by nature*, or hope of mercy ourselves, the remembrance will arrest the uplifted arm of Cruelty."—Few, it is to be feared, will be the instances of restraint from the cruel usage of any stubborn and refractory beasts produced by this reflection. More pertinent is the observation, that "the righteous man, (who, as Solomon remarks, *regardeth the life of his beast,*) knowing that his beast is equally sensible of pain with himself, will not use it in a way he could not justify, if that beast could expostulate with him for cruelty and ingratitude."

The preacher, in the next place, animadverts on that "profanation of the Christian sabbath, by which the cattle are most cruelly deprived of that rest, which a God of mercy hath strictly commanded us to allow them:"—This is certainly a growing evil, that calls for more attention than is commonly paid to it; and we shall rejoice to see it frequently brought before the notice of the public and severely reproved.

The benevolent preacher stigmatizes, moreover, "a very recent species of cruelty, which exceeds every thing of the kind we have ever heard of:—That the horse," says he, "which so nobly excels in courage and strength, should be forced by its mercenary owner to go [in a limited time,] a distance incredible without proof,—is an act of barbarism highly disgraceful to civilized Britain:"—And of this cruelty he specifies, in a note, a most horrid instance.

Upon the whole, this sermon (allowance being made for some exceptionable, because as they appear to us, unscriptural notions,) is well adapted to the occasion on which it was delivered.

The title page informs us, that it was preached at the request of the Reverend Henry Brindley, of Lacock, Wilts; and we understand that Mr. Brindley is the worthy clergyman who, in the year 1799, instituted a Lecture on the Sin of Cruelty towards the Brute Creatures, which was delivered for the first four years at Bath, and since that time, has been preached at many different places. The compliment which he pays those clergymen, who are so obliging as to undertake the office, is Three Guineas a Lecture.

ART. IV. *The Conversion of God's ancient People, the Jews. An Address delivered at Worship Street, Oct. 2, 1808, upon the Baptism, by Immersion, of Mr. Isaac Littleter, one of the Israelitish Nation, on his Profession of Christianity. To which is prefixed an Account of his Conversion. By John Evans, A.M.* Second Edition. pp. 34. 8vo. 1s. Sherwood and Co. 1809.

We noticed with appropriate respect (M. Repos. vol. iii. p. 574.) Mr. Evans's sermon on the Time of Christ's Appearance. This sermon, it appears, fell into the hands of Mr. Littleter, an inquiring Jew, who was convinced by it, that Jesus is the Christ. The great stumbling-block to his embracing Christianity had been the doctrine of the Trinity, maintained with so much pertinacity by so many Christian sects:—On finding however in a conference with Mr. Evans, that the divine Unity is no less taught in the New Testament than the old, his prejudices vanished, and he avowed his faith in Jesus by the apostolic ceremony of baptism by immersion. (M. Repos. vol. iii. p. 574.) Trinitarian Christians, it is stated by the author in a preface, have not been able, notwithstanding their strenuous and continued efforts, to make a serious impression upon the heart of a single Jew!

The "Address" founded on Rom. xi. 1. and turning naturally on the subject of the conversion and restoration of the Jews, is sensible and animated.

To this *second edition* is added "an account of a Roman coin struck on the taking of Jerusalem," and "a description of the triumphal arch of Titus, at Rome."

ART. V. *A Sketch of Lectures on the Evidences of Wisdom and Goodness in the Works of the Creator. By William Turner.* 24mo. Johnson. pp. 18. 3d. 1808.

The instruction of young persons in the principles and duties of religion is the most important branch of the duty of a Christian teacher. Unitarian ministers are we believe behind none of their brethren in this good work. If any be negligent in this particular, we hope Mr. Turner's example will weigh with them. His classification of his catechumens and his plan of lecturing, as explained in the preface to this little tract, we approve entirely: the syllabus before us will be very serviceable to such ministers as wish to go, in the course of their instructions to the young, over the delightful ground of natural theology.

ART. VI. *The Office of Reason in Religion, by John Clark, D.D. Minister of the first church in Boston, Massachusetts, and Author of the "Answer to the Question, Why are you a Christian?"* Eaton.

The "Answer to the question Why are you a Christian," is an inestimable little tract. It is we hope so generally known as to render it needless for us to say any thing at present in its favour. We therefore only observe that this small publication, which is extracted from a sermon of Dr. Clark's, is in every respect worthy of its author; and deserves to be as generally read as the other. The editor merits our thanks for its publication.

ART. VII. *A Preservative against Unitarianism: in a Letter to Lant Carpenter, LL. D. occasioned by his Discourse, delivered at Bristol, before the Society of Unitarian Christians, established in the West of England, entitled "Errors respecting Unitarianism considered; and Motives and Means for the Dissemination of it stated." By Daniel Veysie, B. D. Rector of Plymtree, Devon.* 12mo. pp. 43. Rivingtons. 1809.

A candid but feeble attempt to refute the doctrine of Dr. C's. sermon by the scriptures. We thank Mr. Veysie for abstaining from all personalities and invectives; but we would remind him that if he means to engage in the Unitarian controversy with a chance of success, he must take the field with better weapons than long lists of unexplained texts.

ART. VIII. *An Answer to the Enquiry, Why are you a Dissenter? In a Letter to a friend.* Third Edition, *with Additions.* 12mo. pp. 32. 4d. or 3s. 6d. a dozen. D. Eaton. 1808.

This popular tract is enlarged and improved in this edition by Mr. B. Flower, who has herein rendered an essential service to the cause of non-conformity. The "Answer" seizes upon the most objectionable parts of the established church, and urges objections with much seriousness and cogency of argument. Every Dissenter should be master of the substance of this treatise; and every churchman should in justice to himself be able to "shew cause" against it. To an Unitarian there is a solid reason of dissent not argued here, in the worship of the church of England being addressed to other objects than the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

POETRY.

VERSES

Occasioned by the new modelling and levelling of a church-yard, whereby the repositories of the dead were disclosed, their dust scattered by the winds, and their bones left exposed and uncovered.

By a Weaver of Arbroath, who till within a few months had read none of the English Poets.

In ancient times when Nature's light alone
With dubious ray and feeble lustre shone,
The children still with pious reverence kept
The hallowed ground where kindred ashes slept.
The mossy *cairn*, the stone or shady tree
Preserved their dust from all disturbance free.
When Druids ceased to seek the mystic grove,
And heavenly truth descended from above,
No impious foot with sacrilegious tread
Dared then profane the mansions of the dead:
Such holy awe dwelt in sepulchral gloom,
That sacred as the *temple*, was the *tomb*.
But now alas! from human breasts are fled
The souls that pitied, and the hearts that bled.

Cold and obdurate as the tempered steel,
Now they or cannot, or refuse to feel.
No kind emotion rising on the soul
Prompts the deep sigh, or bids the big tear roll;
No past endearment brought to present view,
Wakes on the mind and kindles grief anew.
Tho' death's dread arm spread devastation wide,
And friends like rain-drops fall on every side,
Indifference looks with cold unmoistened eye,
And callous nature never heaves a sigh.
Laid in the grave, they in oblivion rot,
Alike forgetting and alike forgot.
Retentive memory, faithless to her trust,
Hides with their ashes all she knows in dust.
Tho' generous souls may doubt the muse's theme,
And deem the whole but idle fancy's dream,
That such there are who sympathy pervert,
Their ways can witness and their works assert.

As mortal sight t' external things confined
Sees not what motives actuate the mind,
Judgment mature by justice' upright laws
Must from the action trace the moving cause;
For acts like rivers, backwards traced will shew
The pristine spring and source from whence they flow.

'Tis thus ye sons of Scotia's mountains bleak,
'Tis thus your works your hardened feelings speak.
Yon church-yard razed, ungracious deed! unfolds
What meek-eyed pity with regret beholds.
Rudely uptorn from death's dark caverns drear,
Strewed on the ground, your fathers' bones appear;
Coffins and skulls and sculptur'd stones bespread,
Th' insulted relics of th' unhonoured dead.
No heaving turf in grassy verdure drest
Now marks the place where kindred ashes rest;
Hands vilely rude, with due destructive sweep,
Headlong down hurl'd them from the adjacent steep;
Their human bones in sad confusion laid
Lie thick as leaves beneath the beach-tree shade,
Or those of old which Buzi's son beheld
When Zion's tribes from Palestine expell'd,
By Chaldea's rivers, in religious spleen,
Hung their mute harps upon the willow's green.

Say, where shall now the mourning widow go
To feed her sorrow and indulge her woe,
When faithful memory to her view displays
The by-past pleasures of her former days?
Oft has she thro' yon lonely church-yard strayed,
At twilight hour, in sorrow's garb arrayed;
Beside the spot where her love's ashes slept,
Oft has she bowed and o'er the green turf wept:
But now that spot no more her eyes can trace,
No sacred mark points out the hallowed place,
Razed his swoln grave, the stone uptorn that told
How named, how loved, how honoured and how old.

Perhaps even now some duteous son returns
From torrid climes where ceaseless summer burns,
Where many a year with "honour and applause,"
He fought in Britain's and in Freedom's cause:
Oft had he wishsd (yet then his wish was vain)
To see his home and hail his sire again;
But honour's voice the kind intent forbade,
His country's interest still required his aid:
At length, the long continued conflict o'er,
Again he visits Britain's happy shore;
Enraptured, homeward quick he bends his way
With hopes elated and with spirits gay:
Sweet are the scenes which fancy brings in view,
Scenes old to memory, but by absence new;

His home he sees in all its wonted charms,
His longing sire with ready opening arms;
And oh! what rapture! sees the aged man,
His grey locks trembling and his features wan,
'Midst friends assembl'd draw his seat more near
And bending low lean on his staff to hear
Him talk of battles and exulting tell,
What foes were vanquished and what heroes fell!
But to what changes still must man conform,
What brightening sunshine oft precedes the storm!
His home he finds,—but there no sire he meets,
His *friends* caress him, but no *father* greets.
How pale his cheek, how sickened was the soul
Which unappalled heard war's loud thunders roll,
When now alas! each dream of fancy fled
A sister's tears declare a father dead!
Silent and sad, by filial love imprest,
He seeks the church-yard where his ashes rest—
Rest!—no:—they rest not now—upon the ground
The rude wind blowing scatters them around;
No rising turf, no sculptur'd stone is nigh
To tell th' inquiring mourner where they lie.

When mad ambition drunk with human blood
O'er mankind wields oppression's iron rod,
And lawless power with arbitrary sway
Makes trembling mortals her commands obey,
Then midst their troubles still the wretched have,
The hope of refuge in the peaceful grave;
But ye more rude, even there that rest deny,
Not even the dead can unmolested lie.

Ye hardened souls, unfeeling and unkind,
Deaf to affection and to nature blind,
What pride, what passion, or what hope of praise
Could prompt your hearts to work a deed so base!
Say were those ashes which you purge away,
Too mean to mingle with your nobler clay!
Or on that ground now mournfully renewed,
Where graves are ransacked and where bones are strew'd,
(When death, dread king, performs his high behest,)
Will ye sleep sounder? Will ye softer rest?

THE COTTAGE.

By the side of a stream, at the foot of a hill,
In a neat little cot that was join'd to a mill,
Liv'd a family blest with sweet smiling content;
And the neighbours caress'd them wherever they went.

For old Ralph was a man of devotion and truth,
Who had walk'd with his God from the morning of youth,
And the close of his life, like an evening in May,
Seem'd to promise the cloudless return of the day.

His dear Mary, whom age had made languid and pale,
Was once famed for her beauty, the rose of the vale:
She was pious and chearful, kind hearted and free,
And as steadfast in friendship as mortal could be.

All her household affairs she could manage with ease,
And the joy of her heart was her husband to please.
At the church, in the village, at market and fair,
They were known by the name of *the old happy pair.*

Heaven blest them with children, but took them again,
So that now, only Ralph and his partner remain;
Their best hopes were on high, and they fear'd not the grave,
For they lean'd on an arm that was mighty to save.

When the stranger sat down by the side
of the way,
Overcome by his toils or the heat of the
day;
Poor old Ralph would invite him, with
hearty good will,
To take rest in the cottage, that stood
by the mill.

When the cold blasts of winter roam'd
fearfully round,
And the oaks of the forest were torn
from the ground,
When the snow-drifting cloud in the
valley was spread,
And the dark shades of night fill'd the
trav'ller with dread;

In poor Ralph's little cottage a shelter
he found,
Where the neat blazing hearth shed its
lustre around,
While in sweet social converse the night
stole away,
And the trav'ller forgot all the toils of
the day.

They had no secret hoards, for they
pitied the poor,
And the beggar was never refused at
their door.
Forty summers they liv'd on that sweet
little spot,
And the owners of kingdoms might en-
vy their lot.

But alas! unexpected, their old landlord
died,
And his heir, a young upstart, the vassal
of pride,
Said poor Ralph's little cottage disfigur'd
his grounds,
For he there had determined to kennel
his hounds.

So the mill and the cottage were order'd
away,
And poor Ralph and his partner no lon-
ger could stay.
Tho' resign'd yet they wept, as they
walk'd up the hill,
When the workmen began to demolish
the mill.

To the poor-house they went, where
each evening they're seen,
Leaning out of the window that looks
o'er the green,
Where their cottage once stood, and are
oft heard to say,
While they sigh from the heart, Well a
day! Well a day!

Chester. J. L.

A TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MISS ANN FINCH.

My Anna art thou REALLY gone!
Thy gentle spirit ever fled?
And hast thou then explor'd alone
The darksome regions of the dead?

Thy call how sudden! swiftly flew
Thy years nor halted in their flight;
But yet thy virtues like the dew
Diffuse a fragrance thro' the night.

Thy bright example from the tomb,
Shines with a lustre ne'er to fade:
They who lament thine early doom
Can ne'er forget thy fleeting shade.

Thy duties grew with length'ning days
But well didst thou them all fulfil!
Thy filial love new grace displays
Attentive to a father's will.

Affection's fire glow'd in thy breast
With all a parent's anxious fear;
Nor could a mother more have blest
The objects of thy pious care.

To thee Grief's bitter cup was held,
Yet was thy piety e'er warm!
And in thy life the world beheld
Religion in her fairest form.

Dear sainted maid thy memory lives,
Pure Friendship all thy virtues shrine;
Be mine the path thy pattern gives,
And O may thy rewards be mine!

Birmingham,
April 9, 1809. AMICUS.

THE DUTY AND REWARD OF A CHRISTIAN.

If bless'd with power—protect the weak,
If young—the infirm secure,
If well—compassionate the sick,
If wealthy—feed the poor.

Then will the God of Love bestow
The choicest mental food,
You'll feel what Misers never know,
The bliss of doing good.

And when the Power who joys to save
Proclaims your guilt forgiven
And calls the pris'ners of the grave,
To liberty in Heaven:

While by your new associates led
To bow before the Throne,
They'll twine around your honoured head
A Chaplet from their own.

P.

His home he sees in all its wonted charms,
His longing sire with ready opening arms;
And oh! what rapture! sees the aged man,
His grey locks trembling and his features wan,
'Midst friends assembl'd draw his seat more near
And bending low lean on his staff to hear
Him talk of battles and exulting tell,
What foes were vanquished and what heroes fell!
But to what changes still must man conform,
What brightening sunshine oft precedes the storm!
His home he finds,—but there no sire he meets,
His *friends* caress him, but no *father* greets.
How pale his cheek, how sickened was the soul
Which unappalled heard war's loud thunders roll,
When now alas! each dream of fancy fled
A sister's tears declare a father dead!
Silent and sad, by filial love imprest,
He seeks the church-yard where his ashes rest—
Rest!—no:—they rest not now—upon the ground
The rude wind blowing scatters them around;
No rising turf, no sculptur'd stone is nigh
To tell th' inquiring mourner where they lie.

When mad ambition drunk with human blood
O'er mankind wields oppression's iron rod,
And lawless power with arbitrary sway
Makes trembling mortals her commands obey,
Then midst their troubles still the wretched have,
The hope of refuge in the peaceful grave;
But ye more rude, even there that rest deny,
Not even the dead can unmolested lie.

Ye hardened souls, unfeeling and unkind,
Deaf to affection and to nature blind,
What pride, what passion, or what hope of praise
Could prompt your hearts to work a deed so base!
Say were those ashes which you purge away,
Too mean to mingle with your nobler clay!
Or on that ground now mournfully renewed,
Where graves are ransacked and where bones are strew'd,
(When death, dread king, performs his high behest,)
Will ye sleep sounder? Will ye softer rest?

THE COTTAGE.

By the side of a stream, at the foot of a hill,
In a neat little cot that was join'd to a mill,
Liv'd a family blest with sweet smiling content;
And the neighbours caress'd them wherever they went.

For old Ralph was a man of devotion and truth,
Who had walk'd with his God from the morning of youth,
And the close of his life, like an evening in May,
Seem'd to promise the cloudless return of the day.

His dear Mary, whom age had made languid and pale,
Was once famed for her beauty, the rose of the vale:
She was pious and chearful, kind hearted and free,
And as steadfast in friendship as mortal could be.

All her household affairs she could manage with ease,
And the joy of her heart was her husband to please.
At the church, in the village, at market and fair,
They were known by the name of *the old happy pair.*

Heaven blest them with children, but took them again,
So that now, only Ralph and his partner remain;
Their best hopes were on high, and they fear'd not the grave,
For they lean'd on an arm that was mighty to save.

When the stranger sat down by the side
of the way,
Overcome by his toils or the heat of the
day;
Poor old Ralph would invite him, with
hearty good will,
To take rest in the cottage, that stood
by the mill.

When the cold blasts of winter roam'd
fearfully round,
And the oaks of the forest were torn
from the ground,
When the snow-drifting cloud in the
valley was spread,
And the dark shades of night fill'd the
trav'ller with dread;

In poor Ralph's little cottage a shelter
he found,
Where the neat blazing hearth shed its
lustre around,
While in sweet social converse the night
stole away,
And the trav'ller forgot all the toils of
the day.

They had no secret hoards, for they
pitied the poor,
And the beggar was never refused at
their door.
Forty summers they liv'd on that sweet
little spot,
And the owners of kingdoms might en-
vy their lot.

But alas! unexpected, their old landlord
died,
And his heir, a young upstart, the vassal
of pride,
Said poor Ralph's little cottage disfigur'd
his grounds,
For he there had determined to kennel
his hounds.

So the mill and the cottage were order'd
away,
And poor Ralph and his partner no lon-
ger could stay.
Tho' resign'd yet they wept, as they
walk'd up the hill,
When the workmen began to demolish
the mill.

To the poor-house they went, where
each evening they're seen,
Leaning out of the window that looks
o'er the green,
Where their cottage once stood, and are
oft heard to say,
While they sigh from the heart, Well a
day! Well a day!

Chester. J. L.

A Tribute to the Memory of Miss Ann Finch.

My Anna art thou REALLY gone!
Thy gentle spirit ever fled?
And hast thou then explor'd alone
The darksome regions of the dead?

Thy call how sudden! swiftly flew
Thy years nor halted in their flight;
But yet thy virtues like the dew
Diffuse a fragrance thro' the night.

Thy bright example from the tomb,
Shines with a lustre ne'er to fade:
They who lament thine early doom
Can ne'er forget thy fleeting shade.

Thy duties grew with length'ning days
But well didst thou them all fulfil!
Thy filial love new grace displays
Attentive to a father's will.

Affection's fire glow'd in thy breast
With all a parent's anxious fear;
Nor could a mother more have blest
The objects of thy pious care.

To thee Grief's bitter cup was held,
Yet was thy piety e'er warm!
And in thy life the world beheld
Religion in her fairest form.

Dear sainted maid thy memory lives,
Pure Friendship all thy virtues shrine;
Be mine the path thy pattern gives,
And O may thy rewards be mine!

Birmingham,
April 9, 1809. AMICUS.

The Duty and Reward of a Christian.

If bless'd with power—protect the weak,
If young—the infirm secure,
If well—compassionate the sick,
If wealthy—feed the poor.

Then will the God of Love bestow
The choicest mental food,
You'll feel what Misers never know,
The bliss of doing good.

And when the Power who joys to save
Proclaims your guilt forgiven
And calls the pris'ners of the grave,
To liberty in Heaven:

While by your new associates led
To bow before the Throne,
They'll twine around your honoured head
A Chaplet from their own.

P.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

"The voice of thy brother's blood crieth to me from the earth." Oh! that this verse were made the text for every church in Christendom, till mankind were brought to a due sense of the value of human life! How dignified does man appear, when we view him as a rational being, endued with powers so far superior to the brute creation! how is he degraded when influenced only by brutal passions, and destroying human life with the ingenuity, that might be employed to so much better purposes! The plains of Bavaria have been drenched in blood. A most horrible carnage has been made. The destroying angel has mowed down ranks of men; and, when inquisition is made for blood, to whose account shall it be laid? This is a most solemn question, but amidst the din of arms can it be heard? Man is given up to the dominion of his passions, and violence and blood are the consequence. Both sides cannot be right; where are the preachers of peace and good-will towards men? Why is it, that we call ourselves Christians and yet suffer ourselves to be led away by similar passions, as laid waste the heathen world? This is a melancholy question, and comes home to all our hearts. How ought we not to lower ourselves at the throne of Almighty grace, when we reflect upon these disorders! and surely a due consideration of them would lead us to a better observance of our Saviour's words; "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another."

Austria has published a long manifesto in justification of her conduct, and the French emperor has laid before the world the grounds of his proceedings. Who shall decide between them? Will the blood of a hundred thousand men, the burning of cities, the murders of women and children make the question clearer? Horrible thought! In this age of the world men are to be taught the first rudiments of humanity. The detail of the whole proceedings must shock every feeling mind. Battles for several days decided the fate of the great contest, and the warrior will explore with surprise the instantaneous effect almost of the French emperors plans. What were the schemes of the archduke's it is difficult to determine; those of the French emperor are now sufficiently obvious, and it is manifest, that the manœuvres of his adversary gave him every advantage.

It seems to have been in the power of the Austrians to determine the time and the mode of the attack; and it was made upon a very large scale. The grand army marched from Vienna into Bavaria, and detachments of very great magnitude took the road to Italy and to Warsaw. No resistance scarcely was made in the beginning to either body, and news arrived in England of successes in every part, which excited very sanguine hopes in those, who entertained a favourable opinion of the strength, discipline and courage of the Austrian armies, and the skill of the commander. In the mean time the French emperor was meditating his deadly blow. As to the detachment towards Warsaw, he looked upon it as *hors du combat*, as so many men lost to his adversary, whose success was of no consequence: As whatever ground they now trod over, they must retrace, if his plan was successful. The detachment into Italy made considerable progress, advancing as far as Padua and Verona, and consequently being so far distant from the main body, that it was incapable of rendering it in due time any assistance. Against the main body, then, the whole attention of the French emperor was directed, satisfied that his generals would keep the Italian army of his adversary in check, and perfectly secure as to the Warsaw detachment. At the time appointed in his own mind he flew like an eagle from Paris, and found himself at the head of an army, composed of Frenchmen, Bavarians and Wirtemburgers. The Austrians covered the plains between Ratisbon and Landshut. The disposition of their troops is not known; but wherever Buonaparte appeared, victory attended his steps, and after five days fighting in various places, the Archduke fled across the Danube, and others of his troops fell back upon Austria. The French emperor had one

plan in view, and leaving the fugitives to the north of the Danube to the care of his generals, he pursued the Austrians to their territories, and gave them another complete defeat on their own borders.

The way was now open to Vienna, and this was evidently the first point, on which he fixed his place of repose, and this point he reached on the ninth of May. Thus the south of the Danube was in a manner completely in his possession. The troops in that quarter in Germany and Austria were completely routed and dispersed, and his generals had driven back the Italian army of his adversary. The future acts of the campaign time must develope, but there seems little reason to believe, that the Archduke will be able to make any great stand against the enemy. He is now separated by the Danube from the greater part of his resources. Bohemia lies open to him, but in his rear are the French, and Buonaparte can easily cross over the Danube at Vienna and oppose him with a superior force. In fact his situation is most deplorable, and his brother's empire seems to lie completely at the mercy of the conqueror.

Here the mind naturally pauses to reflect on the vicissitude of human affairs. The counts of Hapsburg were once men of little name, but they rose by degrees, till they established themselves to be the greatest family in Europe. A few years ago Buonaparte would not have been admitted at their court; he would have been regarded with contempt by the majority of the courtiers, if he had visited Vienna as a lieutenant in the French army. He is now raised to such a summit of glory, that kings are in his train, and an emperor must be a suppliant to him for future subsistence. True is it, that God giveth the dominion to whomsoever he pleases, and vain is the boast of any son of man, that his glory shall continue. Still will the human race be infected with pride, and the descendants of a Buonaparte's family may hereafter exhibit the same scenes of imbecility, as have been seen in the Bourbons and the Hapsburgs. The religious intolerance, which has marked both those families, renders their fall less an object of pity, yet time must discover, whether the new dynasty will rule upon better principles.

Whilst Buonaparte is giving law at Vienna, the Russians are advancing against the Turkish empire. They have preceded their march with a declaration of war, and the pretext seems to be very futile. The disturbed state of Turkey is however the grand reason for attack, and it is not improbable, that we shall now soon see developed the plans of the meeting at Erfurt. It will be an extraordinary phenomenon, if the Austrian and Turkish dominions should be dismembered at the same time. There is space between the Danube and the Grecian part of the Mediterranean for the erection of new kingdoms, and the plan of the late empress of Russia may be realized, and a Russian be seated on the throne of Constantinople. The times teem with prodigious events, and a great conflict must be endured before Greece is restored to the civilized world.

Whilst feats of arms call our attention to one part of Europe, the north presents a scene of a different nature. A king has been set aside from his throne without scarcely any tumult, and his subjects have met together to form a new constitution, and to redress the grievances which they suffered under his mismanagement. The diet has been assembled in Sweden: the king's resignation of his crown has been received: they have set him aside and all his family for ever: the duke of Sudermania remains the regent, and is expected to be the king: but he has not as yet assumed the title, and waits till the diet has determined in what manner in future the kingdom shall be governed. To those, who believe that kings rule by right divine, that they are answerable only to the supreme being for their conduct, that the whole business of subjects in relation to politics external or internal is contained in one word, *obey;* this will appear to be a most horrible transaction: but on the other hand they, who have a more enlarged view of things, and contemplate the reciprocal relation of king and subjects, and that a whole kingdom is not to be ruined for the sake of a single individual and his family, and who moreover reflect, that whatever may have been the theories of political writers, or the maxims advanced in state declarations, still the history of the world is filled with the depositions of kings by their subjects, in uncivilized states, generally accompanied with violence and murder, and in a higher degree of civilization with different degrees of order in their proceeding, persons, who reflect on the state of things past and present, will not capriciously condemn the Swedish

nation, but determine on the guilt or innocence of the late king, according to the views they entertain of his conduct. In the diet was not one dissentient voice upon this occasion. It was too apparent that the king who had lost Pomerania and Finland, who had seen a British army in alliance with him enter his ports and sail back without any probable reason, but what arose from his own conduct, it was too apparent, that with such a king Sweden could expect only to fall a prey to its enemies. The diet has now a great task imposed upon it, which in times of less distraction would excite the attention of all Europe. Fortunately however for it, this very distraction prevents very much the interference of foreign powers in its concerns, and the diet will transact its own business, undisturbed by the intrigues of embassadors.

The Prussian government is far from settled. A regiment has deserted from its service, and under the command of a bold officer is exciting war against the French in the circles of Saxony and Westphalia. Many masses of men are said to be ripe for revolt in these quarters, but the late success of Buonaparte will strike too great terror for the colonel to make a disciplined army with his adherents. He is treated as a marauder in the French bulletins, and great is the difference in the language between him, who speaks at the head of a large army, and him who is at the head of only a small troop.

In Spain have been battles and the French claim all the success, yet their power in the north is not completely established, and they have not driven the Junta from Seville. A proclamation from that body however makes us apprehend, that they are in some danger of a removal. They call upon the Spaniards not to be alarmed if such an event should take place, and promise determined resistance, though they should be compelled to shift their quarters. The French will evidently, as soon as they are in sufficient force, secure Andalusia. The Junta will then have no other place of security but Cadiz, and thence a retreat is open for them to South America. They have at last thought of a Cortez, but from what quarters are its members to be summoned? The time is lost, when this measure would have been of importance. A Cortez, summoned at the beginning of the business, would have infused spirit into the whole nation. The national voice would have been heard through its proper representatives, enthusiasm would have been kept alive. But false policy prevailed and though Spain could be preserved only by the people, yet a fear was entertained of their motions. When the ship was sinking, they would not call all hands to the pump.

Portugal has received effectual assistance from this country, and Oporto has been rescued from the hands of the French. An engagement has taken place between our army and the French under Soult, in which the latter was completely routed: but what numbers were engaged is uncertain. The state of the French in that country is not ascertained, and there is some reason to apprehend, that the army under Victor may make an attempt upon Lisbon. If however the Portuguese should really exert themselves, there cannot be a doubt of their ability to preserve the country, and British activity may make a considerable diversion in the north of Spain in favour of the Spanish cause.

Whilst war and confusion were desolating Europe, we were gratified with the news, that the differences between this country and America were completely healed, and that the usual ties of friendship were renewed. Various papers on this subject were printed, the embassador's name was affixed to them, and it was certain that a negociation had taken place, and as far as the President of the United States and the embassador of England were concerned, every thing had been ratified in due form and order. To our great surprise and grief we soon learned, that the British merchants had received intimation of dissatisfaction on the part of ministers to these proceedings, and it was afterwards declared in the House of Lords, that our embassador had gone beyond his instructions. This will increase the difficulties in our arrangements with America, and may preclude farther accommodation; where the blame lies time must discover, but every friend to his country will regret, that any obstacle should be in the way of that cordiality, which it is evidently the advantage of both countries to entertain towards each other.

Melancholy intelligence has reached us from Jamaica. The calamities of Domingo have shocked the compassionate mind, and every prospect of similar confusion in any of our islands must excite the most lively sensations. An insurrection has been meditated amongst the Blacks in Jamaica; private meetings have been holden; leaders have been appointed, and men been exercised. Fer-

tunately the plot was discovered, and the heads of the conspiracy have been brought to justice. How far the plot extended is not known: but when we consider the number of blacks in the island, it is evident that the greatest wisdom is requisite to prevent confusion. The love of liberty is implanted in the human breast; and, when a favourable opportunity occurs, all men, whatever their colour, will rise against those, who are or who are deemed to be their oppressors. The manner in which slavery was first introduced into the West Indies, is a disgrace to the christian name: but now it is established, it is the duty of christians to take care, that in remedying the grievance, greater evils should not be incurred. The gradual increase of free blacks might form a barrier between the whites and the slaves, and as no new slaves are to be imported the danger to be apprehended from the slaves will be gradually diminished. Whilst there are hopes held out of liberty in the most practicable manner, we may expect, that with good instruction and proper attempts at civilization, and the introduction of real christianity; the slave may be preserved from those excesses, which are equally ruinous to himself and his employers.

At home a circumstance has occurred much talked of in the higher circles, and which is of importance as connected with the manners of that class in life. A nobleLord has been guilty of adultery, and adultery afflicting two families, his own and the lady's, in the severest manner. For both the adulterer and the adulteress have children. The adulteress now lives with the adulterer, and the brother of the adulteress thought it right, according to the usual laws of that wicked fashion, which prevails in the higher classes, to attempt to murder the adulterer, giving him at the same time an equal chance of committing murder. The correspondence on this occasion has been published; and it was with great pleasure we observed, that the adulterer, a man of undoubted bravery, and who has distinguished himself very remarkably in the field of battle, refused to add to his other crimes, that of murder. We could have wished, that he had given a better reason for his conduct on this occasion, that in his contrition for his first crime he had added; how shall I sin farther against God, by aiming a blow at your life? How can this expiate my crime, or give you rational satisfaction? We rejoice, however, that the unhappy man would not increase his guilt, and that he has had the courage to decline that appeal to arms, to which fashionable folly has given the name of honour, but which must excite the pity and contempt of all, who are not hurried away in the vortex of dissipation, and have time to reflect on the state of man after this life.

The question of a reform in the representation of the people has been much agitated both within and without the house, and very extraordinary language has been described in the papers to have been held in the house upon this occasion. The most opprobrious names and the worst motives are said to have been assigned to the reformers, a third class now in the state, whose language and conduct by no means give occasion for the epithets which have been bestowed on them. Under this class of reformers, we must comprehend many large counties, cities and boroughs, which in their public meetings, have unanimously decided that the state of the representation is very imperfect and requires reform, and they are completely justified in their assertions by the facts that have come out in the House of Commons; for when it has been allowed by ministers themselves, that a seat in parliament has been made by a minister a subject of barter for a place in India, and ministers have been accused of selling a seat in parliament, and requiring resignation of the member for not voting with them in the Duke of York's question, no longer doubt can remain in the mind of an honest man, that whatever facilitates this mode of corruption ought to be stopped. The reformers have plainly stated their grievances. They state that by the rotten boroughs, the action of the public voice is stifled, and the legitimate use of a House of Commons rendered abortive. Against them, an unmeaning cry is raised, and chiefly by those whose interest it is to preserve abuses, and who fatten on corruption.

Not only in the meetings of counties and corporate bodies, but, as is usual in England, at public dinners, the question has been considered, and at a great public dinner at which Sir Francis Burdett presided, and upwards of fourteen hundred persons attended this meeting from all parts of England. On this occasion a series of resolutions was unanimously passed, expressing the sense of the company on the state of the representation, its consequences, the necessity of amend-

ment, and the mode of obtaining so desirable an end. For the latter purpose, it was recommended that petitions should be sent to the legislature, requesting its interference on this occasion, and it is expected that this measure will soon be adopted by the county of Middlesex and city of London, and be followed by similar bodies. At this meeting, Mr. Wardle, Lord Cochrane, and Mr. Madocks expressed decidedly their opinion on this subject, and with Sir Francis Burdett, may be considered to belong to the third party in the House of Commons, or that party which without reference to the question who is the minister, or aiming at a place, are desirous of pursuing the real good of the nation.

In the House of Commons several important questions were discussed. In two of them which personally affected themselves, ministers were triumphant. In one of them Lord Castlereagh was accused and confessed that he had been engaged in negociating a seat of parliament for a writership in India, and in the other, Mr. Perceval and Lord Castlereagh were involved in an accusation of having sold a seat in parliament. This gave rise to a very important debate on the 11th of May, important as it shews the state of parties in the house and the sentiments entertained by the leaders of the parties under the present and the late ministers on the subject of reform. It is with concern we observe, that from the speeches reported of both of these parties, corruption of members of parliament is allowed and not reprobated. Mr. Madocks introduced the question and the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Lord Castlereagh retired as soon as they had delivered their sentiments of reprobation on the mode pursued by the mover, who after a little debate, moved that the house do on Wednesday next, resolve itself into a committee, to examine into the nature of the charges. The motion was seconded by Sir F. Burdett, and supported by Mr. Curwen, Bidduiph, Whitbread, Lord Folkestone, Sir A. Hamilton and Mr. Wilberforce, and opposed by Mr. Cartwright, Sir Charles Morgan, Mr. Giddy, Tierney, Bathurst and Windham.

For the motion were	—	85
Against it	—	— 320
Majority in favour of the ministers		235

In this opinion the nation we are confident does not agree with the house, and if the votes of its constituents were taken, there would be a majority of at least a hundred to one in favour of an investigation, and in fact the ministers are by this decision of the house, placed in a very awkward situation. They are accused of a crime, and the charge remains unrepelled.

INTELLIGENCE.

ANNUAL ASSEMBLY OF GENERAL BAPTISTS.

The General Baptists, according to their ancient custom, assembled at the Meeting-house, in Worship Street, Shoreditch, on the Tuesday in Witsun-week, May 23d to promote the interests of the denomination. The Assembly is a voluntary association; it gives advice only and does not issue decrees; it is left to individual churches to follow its advice or to depart from it; to observe its regulations or disregard them. The principle of the Assembly is the right of private judgment, and the competency of every church to manage its own concerns;—the utility of it is its being an act of Christian fellowship, its serving as a centre of intelligence concerning the denomination, and its affording an opportunity of co-operation in a common cause. Ecclesiastical history shews that sects have flourished in proportion as the individuals composing them have been in union; and that whenever the members of a denomination have been unknown and indifferent to each other, the denomination has declined and lost its existence.

The public service in the morning was begun by the Rev. J. Evans; the Rev. Stephen Philpot, prayed; and the Rev. J. Jefferey, of Billingshurst, Sussex, preached from *Ecclesias.* xi. 6. The object of the preacher was to shew the difficulties, duties, encouragements and rewards of religious teachers. His discourse was liberal and manly, and well delivered. It gave general and great pleasure to the hearers, who after dinner joined in a request to Mr. Jefferey to publish it, and subscribed for a considerable number of copies. Any persons still wishing to promote the publication

are informed that copies may be ordered of the Rev. J. Marsom, 211, High Holborn, who has undertaken to superintend the subscription.

The members of the Assembly, with many of their friends, dined together to the number of nearly fifty, at the London Tavern. At this meeting some conversation took place on the best means of supporting the *General Baptist Education Society*, under the Rev. John Evans, of Islington; the only seminary for ministers in this denomination, and indeed the only liberal academical institution in and about the metropolis. It was generally agreed we believe, that every friend of the Society, should endeavour to procure new subscribers to it against the next Assembly. Q.

UNITARIAN FUND.

We sit down with inexpressible pleasure to describe the anniversary of this Institution, holden according to custom, on the Wednesday in Whitsun-week, May 24th. We wish that we could convey an adequate idea of the meeting to our readers! It will we believe be long, very long remembered, and serve, as long as it is remembered, as a stimulus to the zeal of many, whether connected or unconnected with the Fund Former meetings had been in the highest degree pleasant and encouraging, but this surpassed them all! Though now mere reporters of the proceedings of the day, we must be indulged if we be seized with some of that enthusiasm which we honestly confess transported us with joy whilst engaged in them.

The Society assembled, agreeably to advertisement at Mr. Vidler's chapel, Parliament Court, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon. Religious service was opened by the Rev. James Lyons, late of Hull, now of Chester, who read the scriptures and prayed. The sermon to the Society was then preached by the Rev. Thomas Rees, minister of Newington Green. The Rev. Sampson Kingsford, of Canterbury, concluded in prayer. The congregation was respectable, and the collection at the doors satisfactory.

Mr. Rees's text was very appropriate: Philip i. 27, 28. *Stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel, and in nothing terrified by your adversaries.* The discourse was animated but correct, manly but liberal, plain but impressive.

On proceeding to business after service, Mr. Wm. Frend was called to the chair. The secretary, Mr. Aspland, read, in the hearing of as many of the congregation as chose to stay, the *Fifth Report of the Committee*, which took up nearly an hour in reading. It appeared to give great satisfaction. If there was less of novelty in it than in some preceding Reports, there was enough to gratify the best feelings of the subscribers. The finances of the Society were described to be in a very flourishing state. A particular detail was given of Mr. Wright's labours, and it administered the liveliest pleasure to the Society to learn that this gentleman was engaged to take, within a few weeks, a missionary tour of *three months* in *Scotland*. The case of *Mr. Gisburne*, of *Soham*, excited particular attention;—he had been persecuted and prosecuted at law by a Calvinistic faction and brought off triumphantly by the exertions of the committee. — The Report was unanimously adopted; and it being stated by the secretary that the printing of the Reports was expensive, and that when printed, they could not be conveyed but with great trouble and after a lapse of time, to the country subscribers, it was unanimously resolved, that the substance of it should be published in the MONTHLY REPOSITORY, under the direction of the Committee, who also should be requested to insert in the same work, with permission of the Editor, such accounts of the Fund and such extracts from the Journals of the missionaries, as they, from time to time, should deem expedient. The greater part of the subscribers are readers of the *Monthly Repository*, and by this means a lively interest will be kept up, as to the measures of the society, throughout the year. To all the well-wishers to the Fund it must be pleasing to know especially that they will not have to wait a year for information concerning Mr. Wright's intended journey, but will have the particulars laid before them almost as soon as they are reported to the Committee.—The proceedings of the committee in the case of Mr. Gisburne were afterwards fully discussed, and it was resolved, on the motion of *Mr. Rutt*, that the subscribers fully approve of them, and that the legal expences incurred in *Mr. Gisburne's* defence be recommended to be defrayed

by a voluntary subscription,—a measure submitted to the meeting by the Committee; any deficiency in such subscription to be made good out of the Fund, any surplus to be applied to the erection of a new and Unitarian place of worship at Soham.

The following gentlemen were chosen into office for the year ensuing, viz.

John Christie, Esq. *Treasurer.*
Rev. Robert Aspland, *Secretary.*

Mr David Eaton
——Thomas Freeman
——Ephraim Burford
——William Tirford
——Thomas Bellerby
——Samuel Barton
——Richard Taylor
} *Committee.*

Mr. Ebenezer Johnston,
——Richard Knight,
} *Auditors.*

The other regular business was then entered upon, and every thing was conducted in the spirit of Christian fellowship.

The ANNUAL DINNER was this year provided, for the sake of room, at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate Street, but on the same economical plan as heretofore; a plan which is found by experience not to exclude the more opulent subscribers, whilst it is an accommodation to those in the humbler walks of life. The largest room in the Tavern soon began to fill. *Wm. Starch, Esq.* was placed in the chair. About ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY PERSONS sat down to dinner ——a company larger than ever assembled, even in the Metropolis, on such an occasion, as avowed Unitarians, and the sight of which infused spirit and joy into every one present. Here were seen members of different congregations, of different communions, uniting in one great object. We observed with delight many gentlemen from the country, some from a great distance, and a large proportion of the young. A sentiment, given from the chair, the only one we think it necessary to particularize, gave us, and we believe all the company, much pleasure: it was this, "Unitarians of all churches; and may they have courage to avow, zeal to promote, and wisdom to unite, in defence of their common principles."—There were no less than *thirty* Dissenting ministers present. We observed the following; the Rev. R. Aspland, A. Bennett, M. Brown, Coupland, T. Davis, Dewhurst, Jos. Dobell, D Eaton, Ellis, J. Evans, J Gisburne, Holl, P. Houghton, J. Jefferey, Jer. Joyce, John Jones, S. Kingsford, Luke Kirby, (of Burnham Thorpe,) Dr. James Lindsay, James Lyons, John Marsom, B. Marten, J. Nightingale, S. Philpot, T. Rees, J. Simpson, Smallfield, Steward, Vidler, Wright.—On the UNITARIAN FUND being given, early in the evening, from the chair, the treasurer *Mr. Christie* rose and read a very *eloquent and animating speech*——viz. a list of subscriptions and benefactions to the Society, obtained since the publication of the last Report, a period of not more than 10 months: the names read amounted at least to 60 and a considerable proportion of them were life subscribers. In this list were not included the new names given in this day.——Mr. *Ebenezer Johnston* addressed the company as treasurer of the Book Society: he spoke at some length and much interested the meeting. He shewed that the various efforts of the Unitarians did not interfere with, but assisted each other; and that therefore the success of one Institution was virtually the success of all.——The *chairman* took occasion from one of the sentiments which he had to give to make some remarks upon the death of such men as Dr. Priestley and Mr. Lindsey; their death, after a life of intellectual improvement and moral usefulness, and at a mature age, he could not consider as a calamity. It was not so much our part to lament that such men had died as to rejoice that they had lived. Their example and history would serve to call up other similar men, for it was always found that the great and good Being who governs the world raises up suitable instruments for whatever purposes he has to effect.——The *Missionaries* addressed the subscribers as usual; viz. *Messrs. Bennett, Gisburne, Lyons* and *Wright*. *Mr. Gisburne* told the tale of his persecution and deliverance, which tho' long was not tedious, but interested every hearer. *Mr. Lyons* declared that tho' fixed over a regular congregation he still gloried in the name of missionary, and should ever consider his connection with the Unitarian Fund as one of the happiest events of his life. With more than usual animation, *Mr. Wright* expatiated upon popular preaching. He stated it to be the result of his observation that amongst the very lowest classes of the people there are two strong opposite tendencies; one to gross superstition, the other to infidelity. In one town mentioned he found many

unbelievers and many followers of the religion of Joanna Southcott. He considered Unitarianism as the only check to these two tendencies in the sphere of poverty, and had actually witnessed its powerful and salutary effects—*Mr. Rutt* introduced to the company the names of two gentlemen, whom from the similarity of the objects pursued by them he ventured to unite, tho' one must be supposed to be absent, the other was known to be present; viz. The Editor of the Monthly Repository, and the secretary of the U. F. the Rev. Robert Aspland. Mr. A. said the Editor of the M. R. was before the public, and must be left to answer for himself. As secretary of the U. F. Mr. A. dwelt a little upon the encouraging prospects of the society. It had rapidly increased every year and would no doubt increase more and more. The projectors of the Fund were as much as others astonished at its prosperity. At every successive anniversary, they were ready to ask, whether the Act of William and Mary against Blasphemy were repealed: The present meeting had brought a great accession of numbers and strength to the Fund; and when numbers and strength, concluded Mr. A., are employed in the cause of Truth and Virtue, no good man can help foreseeing and rejoicing in the result.——— *Mr. Frend* on the health of the *Rev. T. Rees*, the preacher, being drunk by the company, rose to remark upon a sentiment in the sermon that pleased him; viz. that there was a great and obvious difference between ignorance and want of learning. A man might not be a scholar and yet be a well informed man; as he might not be a well-informed man though a scholar. To teach religion requires only a knowledge of it, which a man may have without classical learning. To be able to tell the name of a candlestick in ten different languages does not carry a man a whit towards the right understanding of the New Testament. At the same time the province of learning was described and its true usefulness insisted on.——— *Mr. Hardy* addressed the company for the Committee, and *Mr. Eaton* on being alluded to as the originator of the Unitarian Fund. The Treasurer, finally, stated to the meeting that a considerable number of new names of subscribers had been obtained in the course of the day, and that more than sixty guineas had been subscribed on account of *Mr. Gisborne*. This gentleman's case will be more particularly described in the substance of the Report that will appear in the Monthly Repository; mean-time if any gentlemen absent from the meeting wish to testify their abhorrence of persecution by contributing to the object so unanimously taken up by the subscribers, their contributions will be received by the Treasurer, Secretary, or Committee. It is an encouragement to the opulent to subscribe on this occasion, that any surplus on the subscription list above the actual expences will be faithfully applied to the building of the new Place of Worship.

Such is a faint description of the anniversary of the *Unitarian Fund*. To those who were not present we make no apology for any occasional glow of language in which we may have endeavoured to represent it, because to those who were present we feel that an apology is actually necessary for our failing to give the reader in the preceding representation, a competent idea of the reality.

YORK ACADEMY.

On the 9th instant, at the request of the committee of the congregation of Protestant Dissenters, of the New Meeting, in Birmingham, a sermon was preached from Matt. x. 27. by the Rev. John Kentish, one of their ministers, in favour of the above Seminary. It was a very judicious, appropriate, and animated discourse, delivered with much strength and earnestness. The importance of the institution, for which Mr. Kentish was an advocate, was placed in a strong point of view. The simplicity and œconomy of the domestic plan on which it was formed, were applauded, and every handsome and merited testimony was given to the talents, learning, and disinterested zeal of the gentleman who presides over it. The collection at the doors, after service, amounted to 52*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.* and two gentlemen gave their names as annual subscribers.

20th April, 1809. J. T.

NOTICES.

The first meeting of the ASSOCIATION OF UNITARIAN MINISTERS in the counties of *Lincolnshire, Cambridgeshire*, &c. will be held on Thursday the 22d June, at Boston, when two sermons will be preached, one in the morning, the other in the evening, by the Rev. W. Severn, of Hull, and the Rev. R. Aspland, of Hackney. Mr. Aspland is also expected to preach on the evening of Wednesday the 21st.

The NORTHERN UNITARIAN BOOK SOCIETY will hold its next annual meeting at Nottingham, on Wednesday the 28th of June.—The Rev. Israel Worsley, of Lincoln, is to preach in the morning; and the Rev. Charles Berry, of Leicester, in the evening—The devotional duties and services to be conducted by the Rev. Dr. Phillipps, and the Rev. Mr. Whitelegg—The morning service to commence at half past ten, and that in the evening at seven o'clock.

SOUTHERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY.—The Annual Meeting of this Society will be holden at *Poole*, in *Dorsetshire*, on Wednesday, *July 5th*. The religious services will be carried on in the Rev. Mr. Seward's Meeting-House. The Rev. Mr. Blake, of Crewkerne, is engaged to preach; in case of failure, the Rev. Thomas Rees, of London.

WESTERN UNITARIAN BOOK SOCIETY.—The anniversary of this Society will be held at Bridgewater, in the county of Somerset, on Wednesday, July 5th. The Rev. Edmund Butcher, of Sidmouth, is expected to preach the sermon.

DR. CARPENTER, has Four Letters in the press in reply to Mr Veysies Letter to him entitled, 'A Preservative against Unitarianism.'

CORRESPONDENCE.

The receipt of various communications within the month compels us again to say that we wish the limits of the MONTHLY REPOSITORY enabled us to give that early attention to our Correspondents which their favours deserve. We do as much as our circumstances will permit for the gratification of our writers as well as readers. It is hoped the unavoidable delay in the insertion of papers transmitted to us will not discourage our Correspondents and cause them to withhold valuable communications; though they cannot but perceive the necessity of studying brevity in their papers, as far as is compatible with the design of them.

We have received from the Rev. Dr. Toulmin, whose assistance we have had such frequent occasion to acknowledge, *An Historical Account of the Dissenting Churches in Cambridgeshire*, drawn up by the late *Rev. Robert Robinson*, and the *Rev. J. Thompson* of Clapham.

The following communications are intended for publication:—Verses on Spring, by Master Weller, at Mr. Simons's Academy, Edmonton; Essay on Knowledge, by Mr. Allchin; Mr. Brookes's Remarks on the "Indian Talk," related in the M. Repos: An Original Letter of Mr. John Sing's, of Bridgnorth, communicated by Mr. Severn.

The following are under consideration:——Strictures on Chariclo, by X. Y.; Polytheism, not known to Christianity, in Answer to Chariclo, by Silvanus; The Eclectic Reviewer Reviewed by a Farmer; Clemens on the Arrogance and Ignorance of Eclectic Reviewers.

"The Dying Christian's Soliloquy," is not a happy imitation.——The Rev. F. Stone's Letter, though not uninteresting, is too long, too desultory, and too personal for the public eye.——The scurrilous Review alluded to by X. Y. is beneath the notice of gentlemen and scholars.——E. T.'s Remarks on Chariclo are two contemptuous.——We do not see, with S., the impropriety of any of the expressions in Mr. Bretland's Address at the Lord's Supper; if Jesus Christ was not a divinely commissioned prophet, he must have been either a dupe or a deceiver.——E. C. has our thanks for the Advertisement from the Leed's Mercury, drawn up by the Rev. T. P. Foley, Rector of Old Swinford, in behalf of Joanna Southcott. We mean to preserve it in our next number as a curiosity. The plagiarism at the conclusion is amusing.

In our next we intend to Review *Mrs. Lee's Essay on Government* and *Mr. Jones's Illustrations*. Our Review of the *Tracts of the Unitarian Fund* is unavoidably postponed for the present.